

# **Bacteria TMDL for Mechumps Creek Hanover County, Virginia**

**Submitted by**

**Virginia Department of Environmental Quality**

**October, 2004 (Revised)**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary .....	iii
1. Introduction .....	1
2. Physical Setting .....	2
2.1. Listed Water Bodies .....	2
2.2. Watershed .....	3
2.2.1. General Description .....	3
2.2.2. Geology, Climate, Land Use .....	4
3. Description of Water Quality Problem/Impairment .....	9
4. Water Quality Standard .....	12
4.1. Designated Uses .....	12
4.2. Applicable Water Quality Criteria .....	13
5. Assessment of Bacteria Sources .....	14
5.1. Bacteria Source Tracking (BST) .....	14
5.2. Point Sources .....	15
5.3. Non-Point Sources .....	18
5.3.1. Humans and Pets .....	18
5.3.2. Livestock .....	21
5.3.3. Wildlife .....	23
6. TMDL Development .....	24
6.1. Load-Duration Curve .....	24
6.1.1. Flow Data .....	24
6.1.2. Reference Stream .....	25
6.1.3. Flow Duration Curves .....	26
6.1.4. Load-Duration Curve .....	28
6.2. TMDL .....	30
7. Allocations .....	32
7.1. Consideration of Critical Conditions .....	33
7.2. Consideration of Seasonal Variations .....	33
8. Implementation and Reasonable Assurance .....	34
8.1. TMDL Implementation Process .....	34
8.2. Stage I Implementation Goal .....	35
8.3. Reasonable Assurance for Implementation .....	37
8.3.1. Follow-up Monitoring .....	37
8.3.2. Regulatory Framework .....	37
8.3.3. Implementation Funding Sources .....	37
8.3.4. Stormwater Permits .....	37
8.3.5. Addressing Wildlife Contributions .....	38
9. Public Participation .....	39
10. References .....	40
Appendix A .....	A1
Appendix B .....	B1
Appendix C .....	C1
Appendix D .....	D1
Appendix E .....	E1
Appendix F .....	F1

## LIST OF TABLES

Table E1.	Average annual <i>E. coli</i> loads and TMDL for Mechumps Creek watershed (cfu/yr).....iv	iv
Table E2.	Phase I Load Allocations (based on a 78% reduction).....v	v
Table 1.	Impaired segment description (Mechumps Creek) ..... 2	2
Table 2.	Climate summary for Ashland, Virginia (440327) ..... 7	7
Table 3.	Land use in the Mechumps Creek watershed ..... 8	8
Table 4.	Fecal coliform data collected by DEQ on Mechumps Creek ..... 10	10
Table 5.	Applicable water quality standards..... 13	13
Table 6.	Mechumps Creek bacteria source tracking results..... 15	15
Table 7.	VPDES, VPA, VAG point source facilities and loads..... 17	17
Table 8a.	Estimated fecal coliform production from humans in the Mechumps Creek watershed ..... 20	20
Table 8b.	Estimated fecal coliform production from dogs in the Mechumps Creek watershed.....21	21
Table 9.	Estimated annual fecal coliform production from livestock in the Mechumps Creek watershed ..... 22	22
Table 10.	Estimated fecal coliform production from wildlife in the Mechumps Creek watershed ..... 23	23
Table 11.	Average annual <i>E. coli</i> loads and TMDL for Mechumps Creek watershed (cfu/yr)..... 31	31
Table 12.	TMDL and required reduction for Mechumps Creek ..... 32	32
Table 13.	Average annual load distribution, reduction, and allowable load by source ..... 33	33
Table 14.	Load Reductions and WQS Violation Rates..... 36	36
Table 15.	Phase I Load Allocations (based on a 78% reduction) ..... 36	36

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.	Map of the Mechumps Creek study area..... 2	2
Figure 2.	Map of the Mechumps Creek Watershed.....3	3
Figure 3.	Geology of the Mechumps Creek Watershed.....5	5
Figure 4.	Soil Characteristics of the Mechumps Creek Watershed..... 6	6
Figure 5.	Land Use in the Mechumps Creek Watershed ..... 8	8
Figure 6.	Map of Mechumps Creek watershed ..... 10	10
Figure 7.	Time series of fecal coliform concentrations (station 1APIA001.80) ..... 11	11
Figure 8.	Distribution of fecal coliform samples and violations (station 1APIA001.80)..... 12	12
Figure 9.	Buildings in the Mechumps Creek Basin portion of Ashland, VA.....17	17
Figure 10.	Flow-duration curve for Mechumps Creek near Hanover, VA (station 8-MCP002.42)....25	25
Figure 11.	Load duration curve and observed data for Mechumps Creek at station 8-MCP002.42..... 29	29
Figure 12.	Load duration curve with max exceedance curve for Mechumps Creek at station 8-MCP002.42..... 30	30
Figure 13.	Load duration curve illustrating the TMDL and estimated average annual <i>E. Coli</i> load for Mechumps Creek at station 8-MCP002.42..... 31	31
Figure 14.	Load duration curve illustrating the TMDL and reduction curves for Mechumps Creek at station 8-MCP002.42 ..... 35	35

## Executive Summary

This report presents the development of a Bacteria Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for the Mechumps Creek watershed. The Mechumps Creek watershed is located in Hanover County in the York River Basin (USGS Hydrologic Unit Code 02080206). The waterbody identification code (WBID, Virginia Hydrologic Unit) for Mechumps Creek is VAP-F12R in the Coastal Plain region of Virginia.

The impaired segment is 5.69 miles long. It begins at the Slayden Creek confluence with Mechumps Creek and continues downstream to the confluence with the Pamunkey River.

The drainage area of the Mechumps Creek watershed is approximately 21.8 square miles. The average annual rainfall as recorded at Ashland, VA (within the study area) is 42.20 inches. The watershed study area is approximately 13,950 acres, which is predominately forested (55.3 percent). Agriculture encompasses 26.9 percent of the watershed, with 17.3 percent cropland and 9.6 pasture/hayland. Residential areas compose approximately 11.2 percent of the land base. The remaining 8 percent of the watershed is comprised of wetlands and open water. A map of the distribution of land use in the watershed indicates that the wetlands and forest tend to be located closer to the stream, while the crop and pasture land is farther from the stream.

Mechumps Creek was listed as impaired on Virginia's 1998 303(d) Total Maximum Daily Load Priority List and Report and 2002 303(d) Report on Impaired Waters (VADEQ, 1998 & 2002) due to violations of the State's water quality standard for fecal coliform bacteria. Out of 21 bacteria samples collected at station 8-MCP002.42 during the 1998 assessment period, 7 violated the water quality standard. During the subsequent 2000 assessment period, 3 of 26 samples violated the water quality standard, and during the most recent 2002 assessment period, 6 of 34 samples violated the standard. A total of 71 fecal coliform samples, with 16 water quality standard violations, have been taken by DEQ at station 8-MCP002.42 from July 1990 through August 2003.

According to Virginia Water Quality Standards (9 VAC 25-260-10A), "all state waters are designated for the following uses: recreational uses (e.g., swimming and boating); the propagation and growth of a balanced indigenous population of aquatic life, including game fish, which might be reasonably expected to inhabit them; wildlife; and the production of edible and marketable natural resources (e.g., fish and shellfish)."

As indicated above, Mechumps Creek must support all designated uses and meet all applicable criteria. The Mechumps Creek does not currently support primary contact recreation.

The load-duration approach is used to develop the TMDL for the study watershed.

The assessment of bacterial sources involves estimating loads from various sources in the watershed. It was accomplished by determining the relative contribution by these sources using Biological Source Tracking (BST) methodology. A total of 12 ambient water quality samples were collected on a monthly basis from September 2002 through October 2003 for BST analysis. The results indicate that the majority bacteria are coming from anthropogenic sources. Four categories of sources were considered: human, pet, livestock and wildlife. The analyses determined the relative contribution of all bacteria by these sources. The data indicated that on an average basis, relative contributions of bacteria are – 12% by human, 37% by pet, 29% by livestock, and 22% by wildlife. Fecal and *E.coli* bacteria were also enumerated as part of the BST analyses.

The bacteria loads in the study watershed were calculated for point source and non-point sources. The study area has two minor industrial permittees with average discharges of 0.001 million gallons per day (MGD). The permitted loads were calculated by multiplying the permitted discharge concentration (126 cfu/100 ml) times the permitted flow times the appropriate unit conversions. For non-point sources (human, pets, livestock, and wildlife) total annual fecal productions were calculated separately. Data on

population density and waste production by septic systems, pets, livestock and wildlife were collected from various sources, and total fecal productions were calculated with appropriate unit conversions.

The load-duration method essentially uses an entire stream flow record to provide insight into the flow conditions under which exceedances of the water quality standard occur. There was no gaging station on Mechumps Creek. Therefore, the flow-duration curve using historical flow data collected at the USGS gaging station Totopotomoy Creek near Studley, VA (#01673550) was developed. The load-duration curve for Mechumps Creek was then developed by multiplying each flow level along the flow-duration curve by the applicable water quality standard and required unit conversions. Each water quality observation is then assigned to a flow interval by comparing the date of each water quality observation to the flow record of the reference stream. The stream flow from the date of the water quality observation is then used to calculate a stream flow and flow-duration interval for the stream. The loads on the load-duration curve are multiplied by 365 days/year to determine the annual loads. Fecal coliform data was converted to *E. Coli* using a translator equation developed based on the data sets from the DEQ's statewide monitoring network. The observed loads were plotted on the load-duration curve to determine the number and pattern of exceedances of water quality standards.

The results indicated that the highest exceedance of the water quality standard occurred at a low flow that has been exceeded approximately 90% of the time (~2.14 cfs). This represents the flow condition under which the largest bacteria reduction is required in order to meet water quality standards. The translated load at this flow condition is  $5.82 \times 10^{13}$  cfu/yr. Under the instantaneous *E. coli* standard of 235 cfu/100mL, this load would have to be reduced by 94% to an allowable load of  $3.63 \times 10^{12}$  cfu/yr. The allowable load is simply the *E. coli* standard multiplied by the applicable flow condition and the proper unit conversions.

For the Mechumps Creek watershed, the average annual *E. coli* load is  $3.60 \times 10^{14}$  cfu/yr, and the TMDL under average annual flow conditions is  $3.08 \times 10^{13}$  cfu/yr. These values are used to calculate required reductions. The non-point source (NPS) load allocation,  $2.98 \times 10^{13}$  cfu/yr, was determined by subtracting the waste load allocation ( $1.00 \times 10^{12}$  cfu/yr, from two point sources and the Ashland MS4) from the TMDL (as determined above). These values are presented in Table E1.

**Table E1. TMDL and required reduction for Mechumps Creek**

Allowable Loads (cfu/yr)		Average Annual EC Load (cfu/yr)	Required Reduction
<b>TMDL (annual average)</b>	<b><math>3.08 \times 10^{13}</math></b>		
Wasteload Allocation (WLA)	$1.00 \times 10^{12}$		
MOS	(implicit)		
<b>Load Allocation (LA)</b>	<b><math>2.98 \times 10^{13}</math></b>	<b><math>5.00 \times 10^{14}</math></b>	<b>94.04%</b>

The required reduction of 94% is to be applied to each of the four non-point bacterial source groups identified in the BST analysis.

The Mechumps Creek TMDL development presented in this report is the first step toward the attainment of water quality standards. The second step is to develop a TMDL implementation plan, and the final step is the field implementation of the TMDL to attain water quality standards.

The Commonwealth intends for this TMDL to be implemented through a process of phased implementation of best management practices (BMPs). The development of the Mechumps Creek TMDL requires a 94% reduction in non-point source loading in order to attain a 0% violation of water quality standards. In order to evaluate interim reduction goals for a phased implementation plan, several reduction levels (78%, 70%, and 60%) and their associated violation rates were assessed. Reduction curves similar to the maximum exceedance/reduction curve were plotted and are presented in this report.

Based on the reduction analysis presented above and a goal of 10% or fewer violations of the water quality standard, a suitable Phase I reduction level would be 78%. Table E2 presents the Phase I load allocations based on a 78% reduction of in-stream loads.

**Table E2. Phase I Load Allocations (based on a 78% reduction)**

	<b>Total (cfu/yr)</b>	<b>Human (cfu/yr)</b>	<b>Pet (cfu/yr)</b>	<b>Livestock (cfu/yr)</b>	<b>Wildlife (cfu/yr)</b>
<b>Average Annual Load</b>	$5.00 \times 10^{14}$	$6.00 \times 10^{13}$	$1.85 \times 10^{14}$	$1.45 \times 10^{14}$	$1.10 \times 10^{14}$
<b>Reduction</b>	78%	99%	99%	99%	0%
<b>Target Annual Load</b>	$1.10 \times 10^{14}$	$6.00 \times 10^{11}$	$1.85 \times 10^{12}$	$1.45 \times 10^{12}$	$1.10 \times 10^{14}$

At the 78 percent total annual load reduction level, which results in a 10.8% violation rate, the total allowable annual load equates to the wildlife load. A complete 100% reduction in human, pet and livestock *E. coli* loads is not sufficient to return *E. coli* loads and percent violations less than 10 percent above the water quality standard. Therefore to achieve *E. coli* loads as close to the TMDL as possible without reducing wildlife load, we propose that human, pet and livestock load reductions be set at a goal of the maximum reduction feasible. We expressed this as a 99 percent reduction in Table E2.

Virginia and EPA are not proposing the elimination of wildlife to allow for the attainment of water quality standards. The reduction of wildlife or changing a natural background condition is not the intended goal of a TMDL. In such cases, after demonstrating that the source of fecal bacteria is natural and uncontrollable by effluent limitations and BMPs, the state may decide to re-designate a stream's use for secondary contact recreation or to adopt a site specific criteria based on natural background levels of *E. coli* through a so-called Use Attainability Analysis (UAA). All site-specific criteria or designated use changes must be adopted as amendments to the water quality standards regulations. Watershed stakeholders and EPA will be able to provide comment during this process.

Thus during the first implementation phase, all controllable sources will be reduced to the maximum extent practicable using a staged approach. Following completion of the first phase, VADEQ would re-assess water quality in the stream to determine if the water quality standard has been attained. If water quality standards are not being met, a UAA may be initiated to reflect the presence of naturally high bacteria levels due to uncontrollable sources (wildlife).

Results indicate that approximately 70% of the violations occurred during times of precipitation and increasing stream flow or just after a precipitation event with stable or decreasing stream flow. This suggests that those violations could be related to runoff events. Among some of the BMPs effective in reducing bacteria runoff from such precipitation events include: riparian buffers zone, retention ponds/basins, range and pasture management, and animal waste management. Detailed lists of BMPs and their relative effectiveness will be included in the eventual TMDL implementation plan for the watershed.

The development of the Mechumps Creek TMDL is not possible without public participation. A Technical Advisory Committee meeting was held at the Piedmont Regional Office training room in Glen Allen, VA at 2 pm on January 15, 2004. The public meeting was held at the Hanover Courthouse EMS Building on Rt. 301 at 7 pm on January 27, 2004 to discuss the process for TMDL development and the source assessment input. Copies of the presentation materials was made available for public distribution. The public meeting was public noticed in the Virginia Register. There was a 30 day-public comment period after the public meeting. There was a 30 day-public comment period after the public meeting in which four comments were received. These comments and their responses were submitted to EPA separately from this document.



## 1. Introduction

Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act and US Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) Water Quality Planning and Management Regulations (40 CFR Part 130) require states to develop Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for waterbodies which are exceeding water quality standards. TMDLs represent the total pollutant loading that a waterbody can receive without violating water quality standards. The TMDL process establishes the allowable loadings of pollutants for a waterbody based on the relationship between pollution sources and in-stream water quality conditions. By following the TMDL process, states can establish water quality based controls to reduce pollution from both point and non-point sources to restore and maintain the quality of their water resources (EPA, 1991).

The Commonwealth of Virginia's (Virginia's) 1997 Water Quality Monitoring, Information, and Restoration Act (WQMIRA) codifies the requirement for the development of TMDLs for impaired waters. Specifically section § 62.1-44.19:7 C states:

*"The plan required by subsection A shall, upon identification by the Board of impaired waters, establish a priority ranking for such waters, taking into account the severity of the pollution and the uses to be made of such waters. The Board shall develop and implement pursuant to a schedule total maximum daily loads of pollutants that may enter the water for each impaired water body as required by the Clean Water Act. "*

The EPA specifies that in order for a TMDL to be considered complete and approvable, it must include the following eight elements:

1. It must be designed to meet applicable water quality standards,
2. It must include a total allowable load as well as individual waste load allocations and load allocations,
3. It must consider the impacts of background pollution,
4. It must consider critical environmental conditions or those conditions (stream flow, precipitation, temperature, etc.) which together can contribute to a worst-case exceedance of the water quality standard,
5. It must consider seasonal variations which together with the environmental variations can lead to a worst-case exceedance,
6. It must include an implicit or explicit margin of safety to account for uncertainties inherent in the TMDL development process,
7. It must allow adequate opportunity for public participation in the TMDL development process,
8. It must provide reasonable assurance that the TMDL can be met.

The following document details the development of a bacteria TMDL for Mechumps Creek which was listed as impaired on Virginia's 1998 303(d) Total Maximum Daily Load Priority List. Approximately six miles of Mechumps Creek were listed as impaired due to a violation of Virginia's water quality standard for fecal coliform bacteria and pH.

A glossary of terms used throughout this report is presented as Appendix A.




## 2.2. Watershed

### 2.2.1. General Description

Mechumps Creek, located entirely within Hanover County, is a minor tributary to the Pamunkey River. It is about 10 miles long and flows eastward from its headwaters in Ashland to its confluence with the Pamunkey River near Route 614. The watershed is approximately 8 miles long and 4 miles wide having an area of 21.8 square miles. The major tributaries to Mechumps Creek are Slayden Creek and Campbell Creek, which enter from the north and south, respectively. Figure 2 depicts the Mechumps Creek watershed.

**Figure 2. Mechumps Creek Watershed**



## 2.2.2. Geology, Climate, Land Use

### ***Geology and Soils***


The Mechumps Creek watershed lies within both the Piedmont and Atlantic Coastal Plain physiographic regions. A small segment of the western watershed, around Ashland, is found in the Piedmont while the majority of the watershed is located in the Coastal Plain.

The Piedmont of Virginia extends eastward from the Blue Ridge to the Fall Line, where Paleozoic-age and older igneous and metamorphic rocks are covered by unconsolidated sediments of the Atlantic Coastal Plain. The Virginia Piedmont is part of the greater southeastern Piedmont, which extends from northeastern Alabama through Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, and southeastern Pennsylvania. The Piedmont is characterized by deeply weathered, poorly exposed bedrock and a high degree of geological complexity, making it one of the last frontiers of North American regional geology. (<http://www.geology.state.va.us/DOCS/Geol/pied.html>).

The Atlantic Coastal Plain is the easternmost of Virginia's physiographic provinces. The Atlantic Coastal Plain extends from New Jersey to Florida, and includes all of Virginia east of the Fall Line. The Fall Line is the easternmost extent of rocky river rapids, the point at which east-flowing rivers cross from the hard, igneous and metamorphic rocks of the Piedmont to the relatively soft, unconsolidated strata of the Coastal Plain.

The Coastal Plain is underlain by layers of Cretaceous and younger clay, sand, and gravel that dip gently eastward. These layers were deposited by rivers carrying sediment from the eroding Appalachian Mountains to the west. As the sea level rose and fell, fossiliferous marine deposits were interlayered with fluvial, estuarine, and beach strata. The youngest deposits of the Coastal Plain are sand, silt and mud presently being deposited in our bays and along our beaches. (<http://www.geology.state.va.us/DOCS/Geol/coast.html>)

Figure 3 depicts the geology of the Mechumps watershed.

**Figure 3. Geology of the Mechumps Watershed.**

Soils for the Mechumps Creek watershed were documented utilizing the VA State Soil Geographic Database (STATSGO). Three general soil types were identified using in this database. Descriptions of these soil series were derived from queries to the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Official Soil Series Description web site (<http://ortho.ftw.nrcs.usda.gov/cgi-bin/osd/osdname.cgi>). Figure 4 shows the location of these general soil types in the watershed.


Soils of the Emporia-Johnston-Kenansville-Remlik-Rumford-Slagle-Suffolk-Tomotley (VA027) series are very deep to deep, and vary between well drained to poorly drained with moderately slow or slow permeability. They formed in moderately fine-textured stratified fluvial and marine sediments on the upper Coastal Plain and stream terraces.

The Craven-Mattaponi-Lenoir (VA035) series consists of well or moderately well drained to somewhat poorly drained soils. Permeability for these general soils is moderately slow to slow. This series is formed on cappings in the Piedmont and Coastal Plain uplands that formed in clayey sediments.

Soils of the Bojac-Pamunkey-Munden-Angie-Augusta-Molena-Argent (VA040) series are found mainly in floodplains and terraces. These soils are very deep and range from well drained to poorly or very poorly drained. Permeability for this series ranges from moderately rapid in the uplands to slowly permeable soils formed in clayey marine sediments.



**Figure 4. Soil Characteristics of the Mechumps Creek Watershed**



**Climate**

The climate summary for Mechumps Creek comes from a weather station located in Ashland, VA, with a period of record from 8/02/1948 to 12/31/2002. The average annual maximum and minimum temperature (°F) at the weather station is 68.1 and 45.2 and the annual rainfall (inches) is 42.2 (Table 2) (Southeast Regional Climate Center, <http://cirrus.dnr.state.sc.us/cgi-bin/sercc/cliMAIN.pl?va0327>).

**Table 2. Climate summary for Ashland, Virginia (440327)**

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Annual
<b>Average Max. Temperature (F)</b>	46.4	50.6	58.9	69.7	76.6	83.6	87.1	85.7	79.7	69.2	59.7	49.4	68.1
<b>Average Min. Temperature (F)</b>	25.4	28.2	34.3	43.5	52.8	61.1	65.7	64.5	57.6	45.4	35.8	28.4	45.2
<b>Average Total Precipitation (in.)</b>	3.34	3.03	3.86	3.06	3.83	3.37	4.23	4.07	3.67	3.37	3.09	3.28	42.20

### Land Use

The Mechumps Creek watershed extends approximately 10 miles upstream from the stream's confluence with the Pamunkey River and is approximately 4 miles wide. The approximately 13,950 acre watershed is predominately forested (55.3 percent). Agriculture encompasses 26.9 percent of the watershed, with 17.3 percent cropland and 9.6 pasture/hayland. Residential areas compose approximately 11.2 percent of the land base. The remaining 8 percent of the watershed is comprised of wetlands and open water.

A map of the distribution of land use in the watershed (Figure 5) shows that the concentration of urban land is found in the western portion of the watershed around Ashland and in Hanover, located in the eastern section of the watershed. Forestland and agriculture is scattered throughout the watershed.


Land use characterization was based on National Land Cover Data (NLCD), developed cooperatively by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Geological Survey. NLCD data is derived from satellite and aerial images circa 1992. For more information of this data source, please visit <http://www.epa.gov/mrlc/nlcd.html>.

**Table 3: Mechumps watershed land use distribution by major land use category.**

Land Use Name and Code <sup>†</sup>	Area (acres)	Area (%)
Open Water	166.13	1.19
Low Intensity Residential	757.03	5.43
High Intensity Residential	617.37	4.43
Transitional	23.13	0.17
Deciduous Forest	5708.21	40.94
Evergreen Forest	386.08	2.77
Mixed Forest	1614.81	11.58
Pasture/Hay	1336.82	9.59
Row Crops	2412.98	17.30
Woody Wetlands	774.60	5.56
Emergent Herbaceous Wetlands	145.67	1.04
Total:	13942.83	100.00

<sup>†</sup> NLCD, 1992.



**Figure 5. Land Use in the Mechumps Creek Watershed**

### 3. Description of Water Quality Problem/Impairment


Mechumps Creek was listed as impaired on Virginia's 1998 and 2002 303(d) Total Maximum Daily Load Priority List and Report (VADEQ, 1998 & 2002) due to violations of the State's water quality standard for fecal coliform bacteria. Mechumps Creek was listed as impaired on Virginia's 1994 303(d) Total Maximum Daily Load Priority List and Report (VADEQ, 1994) due to violations of the state's water quality standard for pH. Out of 21 bacteria samples collected during the 1998 assessment period, 7 violated the water quality standard. During the subsequent 2000 assessment period, 3 of 26 samples violated the water quality standard, and during the most recent 2002 assessment period, 6 of 34 samples violated the standard.

A total of 71 fecal coliform samples, with 16 water quality standard violations, have been taken by DEQ at station 8-MCP002.42 (Figure 6) from July 1990 through August 2003 (Table 4). Please note that for each assessment period, DEQ evaluates the available data from a five year time period prior. For example, the 1998 assessment reviewed water quality data from January 1, 1992 – December 31, 1996. The 2002 assessment used data from January 1, 1996 – December 31, 2000.

**Table 4. Fecal coliform data collected by DEQ on Mechumps Creek**

Station	Date of First Sample	Date of Last Sample	Number of Samples	(Cfu/100 ml)			Number of Exceedances*
				Average	Minimum	Maximum	
8-MCP002.42	07/17/1990	08/05/2003	71	774	10	8000	16

\* Exceedances of the then-applicable instantaneous standard of 1,000 cfu/100 mL, and 400 cfu/100mL after Jan 2003

**Figure 6. Map of Mechumps Creek watershed**

A time series graph of all data collected at station 8-MCP002.42 shows the FC concentrations ranging from 10 to 8000 cfu/100 ml (Figure 7). The horizontal line at the 1000 cfu/100 ml and 400 cfu/100ml marks represents the then-applicable instantaneous fecal coliform water quality standards. The data points above the 1000 cfu/100 ml / 400 cfu/100 ml line illustrate violations of the water quality standard.

**Figure 7. Time series of fecal coliform concentrations (station 8-MCP002.42)**





Figure 8 presents the number of water samples and exceedances (instantaneous fecal water quality standard - 1000 cfu/100mL, or 400 cfu/100mL after Jan 2003) by month.

**Figure 8. Monthly distribution of fecal coliform samples and violations (station 8-MCP002.42)**



## 4. Water Quality Standard

According to Virginia Water Quality Standards (9 VAC 25-260-5), the term “water quality standards means provisions of state or federal law which consist of a designated use or uses for the waters of the Commonwealth and water quality criteria for such waters based upon such uses. Water quality standards are to protect the public health or welfare, enhance the quality of water and serve the purposes of the State Water Control Law (§62.1-44.2 et seq. of the Code of Virginia) and the federal Clean Water Act (33 USC §1251 et seq.).”

As stated above, Virginia water quality standards consist of a designated use or uses and a water quality criteria. These two parts of the applicable water quality standard are presented in the sections that follow.

### 4.1. Designated Uses

According to Virginia Water Quality Standards (9 VAC 25-260-10A), “all state waters are designated for the following uses: recreational uses (e.g., swimming and boating); the propagation and growth of a balanced indigenous population of aquatic life, including game fish, which might be reasonably expected to inhabit them; wildlife; and the production of edible and marketable natural resources (e.g., fish and shellfish).”

As stated above, Mechumps Creek must support all designated uses and meet all applicable criteria.

## 4.2. Applicable Water Quality Criteria

The applicable water quality criteria for bacteria in the Mechumps Creek watershed has changed since the initial listing on the 303(d) report. Following EPA recommendations, the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) proposed more stringent fecal coliform bacteria standards as well as new standards for *Escherichia coli* (*E. coli*) bacteria. These new standards were adopted by the State Water Control Board in May 2002, public noticed in June 2002, approved by the USEPA in November 2002, and were effective January 15, 2003.

The EPA recommendation that states adopt *E. coli* and enterococci (saltwater) standards stems from a stronger correlation between the concentration of *E. coli* and enterococci organisms and the incidence of gastrointestinal illness. *E. coli* and enterococci are both bacteriological organisms that can be found in the intestinal tract of warm-blooded animals. *E. coli* is a subset of fecal coliform group; thus a waterbody listed as impaired for fecal coliform is considered to be listed for *E. coli* as well.

Although Mechumps Creek was listed as impaired due to a violation of the previous fecal coliform standard, the TMDL must be developed to meet the new *E. coli* bacteria standard. The interim fecal coliform bacteria standard presented below will not apply to this TMDL since 12 *E. coli* bacteria samples were collected as part of the bacteria source tracking study of the source assessment.

### New Bacteria Standards

For a non-shellfish supporting water body to be in compliance with Virginia bacteria standards for primary contact recreational use, the DEQ specifies the following criteria (9 VAC 25-260-170):

1. *Fecal coliform bacteria shall not exceed a geometric mean of 200 fecal coliform bacteria per 100 ml of water for two or more samples over a calendar month nor shall more than 10% of the total samples taken during any calendar month exceed 400 fecal coliform bacteria per 100 ml of water. This criterion shall not apply for a sampling station after the bacterial indicators described in subdivision 2 of this subsection have a minimum of 12 data points or after June 30, 2008, whichever comes first.*

2. *E.coli and enterococci bacteria per 100 ml of water shall not exceed the following:*

**Table 5. Applicable water quality standards**

Parameter	Geometric Mean <sup>1</sup> (cfu/100 ml)	Single Sample (cfu/100 ml)
<i>E.coli</i> (fresh water)	126	235
Enterococci (saltwater & Transition Zone 3)	35	104

<sup>1</sup> for two or more samples taken during a calendar month.

If the waterbody exceeds the criterion as listed above in more than 10.5 percent of samples, the waterbody is classified as impaired and a TMDL must be developed and implemented to bring the waterbody into compliance with the water quality criterion. Based on the sampling frequency, only one criterion is applied to a particular datum or data set (9 VAC 25-260-170). If the sampling frequency is one sample or less per calendar month, the instantaneous criterion is applied; for a higher sampling frequency, the geometric mean criterion is applied.

For Mechumps Creek, the TMDL is required to meet the instantaneous criterion since the load-duration approach used to develop the TMDL for Mechumps Creek yields the maximum allowable bacteria concentration under any given flow condition. Unlike a continuous time series simulation, the flow duration approach does not yield daily bacteria concentrations which are needed to apply the geometric

mean standard. Such an approach ensures that TMDLs, when implemented, do not result in violations under a wide variety of scenarios that affect bacteria loading.

## 5. Assessment of Bacteria Sources

The assessment bacteria sources in traditional bacteria TMDL studies involves estimating loads from sources in the watershed and developing a computer model to establish the links between estimated loads and actual in-stream bacteria concentrations.

In a load-duration bacteria TMDL, source assessment is accomplished by determining the relative contribution by source of the fecal bacteria contained in a sample of stream water. This method of source identification is achieved through microbial source tracking (MST). MST methods that specifically use bacteria as the target organism are referred to collectively as bacteria source tracking (BST) methods. MST has been applied to study microbial ecology of environmental systems for years and are now being applied to help improve water quality by identifying problem sources and determining the effect of implemented remedial solutions. Management and remediation of water pollution would be more cost effective if the correct sources could be identified (Simpson, 2002).

To support BST analyses in load-duration TMDLs, bacteria loading in a watershed is also estimated. These load estimates are broken into point and non-point sources. It is important to note that the non-point source load estimates represent loading to the surface of the watershed; they are not estimates of in-stream loads.

The following sections present BST analysis and point- and non-point source load estimates.

### 5.1. Bacteria Source Tracking (BST)

#### Background

MST methods can be divided into three categories: molecular (genotype), biochemical (phenotype), and chemical. Molecular methods may offer the most precise identification of specific types of sources but are limited by high per-isolate costs and detailed and time-consuming procedures. They are not yet suitable for assaying large numbers of samples in a reasonable time frame. Biochemical methods (BST) may or may not be as precise, but are more simple, quicker, less costly, and allow large numbers of samples to be assayed in a short period of time (Hagedorn, 2002).

Several biochemical BST methods are in various stages of development. Among these are Antibiotic Resistance Analysis (ARA), F-Specific (F+ or FRNA) Coliphage, Sterols or Fatty Acid Analysis, Nutritional Patterns, and Fecal Bacteria Ratios. Of these, ARA has been chosen as the BST method for this TMDL report.

The ARA method uses fecal streptococcus (including the enterococci) and/or *E. coli* and patterns of antibiotic resistance for separation of sources. The premise is that human fecal bacteria will have the greatest resistance to antibiotics and that domestic and wildlife animal fecal bacteria will have significantly less resistance (but still different) to the battery of antibiotics and concentrations used. Most investigators are testing each isolate on 30 to 70+ antibiotic concentrations (Hagedorn, 2002). A more detailed description of the ARA method used by MapTech, Inc. in support of this TMDL is presented in Appendix B.

## BST Sampling and Results

A total of 12 ambient water quality samples were collected by DEQ staff and submitted to MapTech, Inc. (MapTech) for BST analysis. The BST analyses performed by MapTech determined the relative contribution of overall bacteria by human, canine, livestock, and wildlife sources. Fecal and *E. coli* bacteria were also enumerated as part of the analyses performed by MapTech. Results of the Mechumps Creek BST sampling program are presented in Table 6.

**Table 6. Mechumps Creek bacteria source tracking results**

Sample Date	Fecal Coliform (cfu)	<i>E. coli</i> (cfu)	BST Distribution (%)			
			Human	Pet	Livestock	Wildlife
9/23/02	1100	54	33	42	17	8
10/16/02	8000	3000	21	25	17	37
11/12/02	3300	2400	8	46	13	33
12/9/02	30	23	0	41	32	27
1/8/03	60	18	0	100	0	0
2/5/03	30	15	0	50	20	30
3/17/03	BDL	BDL	-	-	-	-
4/14/03	70	48	63	0	6	31
5/21/03	670	100	0	17	58	25
6/16/03	2300	210	0	21	79	0
7/28/03	490	120	4	25	25	46
8/5/03	6000	3100	4	38	50	8
Average			12	37	29	22
Standard Deviation			20	26	24	16

The BST data results indicate that the majority bacteria are coming from anthropogenic sources. Approximately 78% of the bacteria found in the Mechumps Creek study comes from human, pet, or livestock sources.

## 5.2. Point Sources

Bacteria loading from point sources such as sewage treatment plants, small commercial establishments, schools, homes and businesses require permits under the Virginia Pollution Discharge Elimination System (VPDES) permit program. In order to consider all such point-source discharges in the Mechumps Creek watershed, the DEQ comprehensive environmental database, regional DEQ permit staff, and local Virginia Department of Health (VDH) offices were all queried. There are three VPDES General Permits in the Mechumps Creek watershed. Two of these have *E. coli* permit limits, while the other is not permitted for *E. coli* discharge. These two bacteria point source dischargers with General Permits were identified equal to or less than 1000 gallons per day. In addition, there is one Industrial Minor Permittee, which does not have a bacterial discharge.

The industrial minor and the VPDES general permit facility not permitted for sewage discharge will not be used to determine fecal bacteria loads. (\*They do report pH data and will be used for the pH assessment.)

There is one permitted VAR discharger in the Mechumps Creek watershed, the Ashland Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) (VAR040011). The Hanover MS4 permit does not include the Mechumps Creek watershed (Hanover County Dept. of Public Works, personal communication, 2004)

The permitted point sources are presented in Table 7.

Current EPA guidance requires a bacterial waste load allocation to be determined for MS4 permits, therefore the Ashland Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (VAR040011) will be allotted a fecal bacteria load allocation. There are a number of methods to derive wasteload allocations in watersheds. Where a sewage treatment plant or other permitted treatment plant is discharging to the system, the flow rate and pollutant of concern are normally measured at the discharge and regulated by a permit issued by DEQ. In this case the waste load is known or easily derived. In watersheds where non-point source contributions arrive through diffuse storm water management systems and multiple differing BMPs which may not be monitored for the pollutant of concern, determining a wasteload allocation is not as direct and therefore much more approximate.

A simple but useful approach in diffuse storm water management systems such as in Henrico County is to adopt an averaging approach based on land use and known average impervious area per land use type. This is the approach adopted for this TMDL. In three previous bacterial TMDLs (Accotink Creek, Four Mile Run, and Lynnhaven Bay) DEQ estimated MS4 bacterial waste load allocation by the % impervious portions of urban land use area. Note that the TMDL does not directly model MS4 bacterial wasteload allocation, but derives a gross estimate of the MS4 wasteload allocation. Percent imperviousness for White Oak Swamp urban land use types was adapted from Table 5.5, page 37, of the Lynnhaven Bay bacterial TMDL, shown below.

Adapted from Table 5-5, Average Percent Imperviousness  
in the Lynnhaven, Braod and Linkhorn Bay Watershed

Land Use Type	Percent Imperviousness
Single Family / Duplex	20%
Town House	50%
Multi-Family	70%
Commercial	70%
Office	70%
Industrial	65%
Military	50%
Streets	90%
Public/semi-public	8%
Park	2%
Agri - cropland	2%
Agri – pasture	2%
Marsh / Wetland	2%
Approved for development	2%
Undeveloped	2%

Low intensity residential land use in the Mechumps watershed was given 20% imperviousness from the Single family / duplex land use for Lynnhaven Bay. The high intensity residential Mechumps land use was given 50% imperviousness from townhouse imperviousness in Lynnhaven, and high intensity commercial Mechumps land use was given 70% imperviousness from commercial land use in Lynnhaven. The total acres within the Ashland town limits in the Mechumps watershed are 1313.28 acres, from the Ashland and Seven Pines, VA topos. The acres of these urban Mechumps land uses were multiplied by the respective % imperviousness, and the resulting impervious acres were totaled. Then the impervious acres were divided by the total acres in the Mechumps watershed, to give % impervious acres in the Ashland portion of the Mechumps watershed. This was equated with the % imperviousness in the Ashland portion of the Mechumps watershed, which was multiplied by the non-point source TMDL



allowable load determined below in Section 6.2. The Ashland MS4 wasteload allocation was estimated to be  $9.86 \times 10^{11}$  cfu/yr. The calculation is described in Appendix C.

**Table 7. VPDES, VPA, VAG and VAR point source facilities and loads**

Stream Name	Facility Name	VPDES Permit Number	Discharge Type <sup>1</sup>	Design Flow (MGD)	Permitted <i>E.coli</i> Limit (cfu/100 ml)	<i>E. coli</i> Wasteload Allocation (cfu/yr)
Mechumps Creek	Hanover County Central Garage	VAG750109	Industrial Minor	0.001	0	0
Mechumps Creek	Truckstops of America BP	VA0070572	Industrial Minor	0.030	0	0
Mechumps Creek	Lee's Mobile Station	VAG404066	Industrial Minor	0.001	126 cfu/100 ml	$1.74 \times 10^9$
Mechumps Creek	Hanover Community Center	VAG404137	Industrial Minor	0.001	126 cfu/100 ml	$1.74 \times 10^9$
Existing WLA					Total	$3.48 \times 10^9$
Expansion Matrix						
					Total X 2	$6.96 \times 10^9$
					Total X 5	$1.74 \times 10^{10}$
<b>MS4 Permits</b>						
Entire Mechumps Creek Watershed Urban land use area west of I-95	Ashland Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System	VAR040011	MS4	NL	NA	$9.86 \times 10^{11}$
					<b>Total of TMDL WLA (non-expanded)</b>	<b><math>9.89 \times 10^{11}</math></b>

<sup>1</sup>STP = Sewage Treatment Plant, WTP = Water Treatment Plant, SFH = Single Family Home ( $\leq 1000$  gpd), NL = No limit, NA = Not Applicable

Where permit limits exist, permitted loads were calculated by multiplying the permitted discharge concentration (126 cfu/100 ml) times the design flow (0.001 MGD or 1000 gal/day) times the appropriate unit conversions ( $1.3816345 \times 10^{10}$ ). The calculation is presented in Appendix C. The total wasteload allocation for the two General permittees with bacterial limits is  $3.48 \times 10^9$  cfu/yr. Neither Hanover County Central Garage nor Truckstops of America BP has legal discharges of *E. coli*, thus there are no permitted *E. coli* loads for these facilities.

To account for future increases in point source loading, the wasteload allocation will be multiplied by a factor of 5, to  $1.74 \times 10^{10}$  cfu/yr in future calculations. The Ashland MS4 wasteload allocation was determined to be  $9.86 \times 10^{11}$  cfu/yr as described above. Multiplication of an MS4 wasteload allocation by 5 does not occur with MS4 loads because they are a non-point source contribution and not as easily controlled. Therefore the total wasteload allocation is  $1.74 \times 10^{10}$  cfu/yr +  $9.86 \times 10^{11}$  cfu/yr =  $1.00 \times 10^{12}$  cfu/yr.

### **5.3. Non-Point Sources**

In order to gain an understanding of non-point source loading in the Mechumps Creek watershed, bacteria loads for typical non-point sources were estimated. These estimates were based upon animal and human population data sets, typical waste production rates and typical bacteria densities in waste products.

Currently published values for fecal bacteria production rates are primarily in terms of fecal coliform. There is little data on *E. coli* production; however, studies have shown that though minor variability will exist between sources, *E. coli* represents roughly 90-95% of fecal coliforms contained in "as-excreted" fecal material (Yagow, 2002). This implies that the relative bacteria contribution by source should remain constant.

It is important to note that the bacteria loads presented in the following sections on non-point sources represent "as-produced" loads. This is to say that some portion of an estimated load may not be available to be transported to Mechumps Creek in runoff.

#### **5.3.1. Humans and Pets**

Bacteria loading from human sources can come from straight pipes, failing septic systems, and land-applied biosolids. Failing septic systems are typically manifested by effluent discharging to the ground surface where the bacteria laden effluent is then available to be washed into a stream as runoff during a precipitation event. In contrast, discharges from straight pipes are typically directly deposited to streams.

All biosolids can contain a certain concentration of fecal bacteria. When biosolids are applied to the land surface, the potential exists for a portion of these fecal bacteria to be transported to a stream as runoff during storm events.

##### ***Straight Pipes***

The Hanover County office of the VDH reported no known straight pipes in the Mechumps Creek Watershed.

##### ***Septic Systems***


Based on 2000 U.S. Census data, the Mechumps Creek watershed is populated by approximately 3981 residents living in approximately 1469 households. This was derived from an area ratio of the [Mechumps basin (21.8 sq. mi.)] / [Hanover County (473 sq. mi.)] multiplied by the population of Hanover County (86,320 persons) divided by 2.71 persons per household.

This estimate is low, because GIS mapping of buildings in the Mechumps basin portion of Ashland alone yields an estimated **1522** households (Randolph-Macon College and Hanover County, personal communication, 2003). See Figure 9 for buildings in the Mechumps basin portion of Ashland, VA. These households in the Mechumps Creek basin portion of Ashland, VA are serviced by the Ashland STP, and thus do not use septic systems. In addition 29 sewer hook-ups in the Mechumps Creek basin portion of Hanover Courthouse do not use septic systems.

In the remainder of the Mechumps Creek basin, GIS mapping revealed 1450 buildings. Ten GIS surveys of neighborhoods in the basin revealed an average of 70 percent of the buildings were residential households, leaving **1015** households in the remainder of the Mechumps Creek basin east of Ashland. Thus GIS estimates yield  $1522 + 1015 = \mathbf{2537}$  households in the entire Mechumps basin. Of this number  $2537 - 1522 - 29 = \mathbf{986}$  are estimated to use septic systems.

Using the 2000 Census figure of 2.71 persons per household, that yields an estimated Mechumps Creek basin human population of **6876** persons, which is deemed by best professional judgment to be more reliable than the 3961 person estimate by area ratio.

**Figure 9. Buildings in the Mechumps Creek basin portion of Ashland, VA.**



Assuming that 986 households with a population of 2672 persons are on septic systems, with a wastewater production rate of 75 gallons per day per person (Geldreich, 1978), and a fecal coliform density in septic tank waste of  $1.04 \times 10^6$  cfu per 100 mL (MapTech, 2002), the total septic load in the Mechumps Creek watershed is estimated to be  $2.89 \times 10^{15}$  cfu per year (Table 8a). Of this total septic load, only the load from failing septic systems would be available as runoff.

**Table 8a. Estimated fecal coliform production from humans in the Mechumps Creek watershed**

Source	Population	Waste Production Rate (/100ml/yr/person)	Waste Fecal Coliform Density (cfu/100 ml)	Total Est. Annual Fecal Production (cfu/yr)
Septic Systems	2672	75 gal/day/person x 37.85412/ 100mL/gal x 365 days/yr = $1.04 \times 10^6$ *	$1.04 \times 10^6$ **	$2.89 \times 10^{15}$

\* Geldreich, 1978. A conversion factor of 37.85412 was used to convert gallons to 100mL.

\*\* MapTech, 2002 (Gills Creek TMDL Report).

Septic system failure rates depend largely on the age of the septic system. Surveys of failing septic systems in other Virginia watersheds have yielded a formula for calculating a rate of septic system failures for a given area. In the preparation of a TMDL report for the Goose Creek watershed in Loudoun County, VA, such a formula was used to estimate a septic system failure rate in Loudoun County. The estimated failure rate was calculated to be as high as 17% for some portions of the county (ICPRB, 2002). In the absence of a septic system survey, the Goose Creek TMDL report specified a failure rate of 5% (ICPRB, 2002). This figure is based on the calculated failure rate, the professional judgement of the local health department, and results of a BST study completed for the Goose Creek watershed.

For this TMDL we assumed a 10% failure rate, having referenced 5 to 17% rates. At the 10% failure rate, with an estimated annual production rate of  $2.89 \times 10^{15}$  cfu/yr, the annual septic loading available as runoff to Mechumps Creek was estimated to be  $2.89 \times 10^{14}$  cfu/yr.

### **Biosolids**

In the Commonwealth of Virginia, the VDH and the DEQ regulate biosolids generation and application to the land surface. The DEQ regulates the generation of biosolids and the land application of those biosolids by the generator. The VDH regulates contractors who transport and spread biosolids; the biosolids can be from in-state or out-of-state sources.

The DEQ comprehensive environmental database was queried for biosolids application permits in the Mechumps Creek watershed, and none were found. Likewise all biosolids use permits on file with the VDH central office were reviewed. No permits to apply biosolids in the Mechumps Creek watershed were found.

### **Pets**

The number of pets in the watershed was estimated based on the number of households. Assuming an average of 1.7 dogs and 2.1 cats per household (National Pet Owner Survey, American Pet Products Manufacturers Association, 2001-2002), the estimated pet population in the Mechumps Creek watershed consists of 4313 dogs and 5328 cats. Cats are estimated to have approximately one fifty-thousandth of the fecal coliform density of dogs, and thus are deemed insignificant in pet fecal bacteria production. Using the waste production rates and fecal coliform densities from MapTech, 2002, the total bacteria loads from dogs and cats in the Mechumps Creek watershed are  $3.40 \times 10^{14}$  and  $3.39 \times 10^8$  cfu per year, respectively. Table 8b presents the calculation of pet loads in the watershed. It should be noted that the numbers presented in Table 8b represent loads available for runoff and not in-stream loads.

**Table 8b. Estimated fecal coliform production from pets in the Mechumps Creek watershed**

Source	Population	Waste Production Rate/Day	Waste Fecal Coliform Density	Total Est. Annual Fecal Production
Dogs	4313 dogs	450 g/dog **	$4.8 \times 10^5$ cfu/g **	$3.40 \times 10^{14}$ cfu/yr
Cats	5328 cats	19.4 g/cat **	9 cfu/g **	$3.39 \times 10^8$ cfu/yr

\* Geldreich, 1978. A conversion factor of 37.85412 was used to convert gallons to 100mL.

\*\* MapTech, 2002 (Gills Creek TMDL Report).

Estimated FC production rates are based on estimated data on households, pets/household, production rates, fecal coliform density etc. All these can vary widely. The assumptions we make on animal populations are the best available to us, and may not reflect pet E. coli load calculated by other means, i.e., the average annual load indicated by actual bacterial sampling.

### 5.3.2. Livestock

Fecal matter from livestock can be deposited directly to the stream in instances where livestock have stream access, or the fecal matter can be transported to the stream in surface runoff from grazing or pasture lands.

The predominant types of livestock in the Mechumps Creek watershed are cattle and horses, although all types of livestock were considered in developing the TMDL. 1997 Census of Agriculture data for Hanover County were used to estimate the livestock population in the watershed. The Mechumps Creek watershed is located entirely within Hanover County and contains approximately 4.6% of the total pasture land in the county as determined by area ratio. Table 9 presents the livestock population estimates, ranges of fecal production rates, and ranges of estimated annual fecal production in the watershed. The Hanover-Caroline Soil and Water Conservation District refined the beef cattle, dairy cows, pigs and sheep numbers, and stated that ALL cattle in the basin are located Just below Rt. 301 and are fenced from the creek (HCSWCD, personal communication, 2003). It should be noted that the numbers presented below represent loads available for runoff and not in-stream loads.

<b>Table 9. Estimated annual fecal coliform production from livestock in the Mechumps Creek watershed</b>					
<b>Source</b>	<b>Population<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Range of Fecal Coliform Production Rates<sup>2</sup></b>		<b>Range of Annual Fecal Coliform Production</b>	
		<b>(cfu/animal/day)</b>		<b>(cfu/yr)</b>	
		<i>Low</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>High</i>
Beef Cows	100	$4.28 \times 10^6$	$1.2 \times 10^{12}$	$1.56 \times 10^{11}$	$4.38 \times 10^{16}$
Dairy Cows	0	$2.19 \times 10^6$	$1.76 \times 10^{12}$	0	0
Pigs	0	$5.01 \times 10^6$	$1.72 \times 10^{13}$	0	0
Sheep	200	$1.76 \times 10^7$	$4.93 \times 10^{11}$	$1.28 \times 10^{12}$	$3.60 \times 10^{16}$
Horses <sup>3</sup>	49	$7.44 \times 10^5$	$1.68 \times 10^9$	$1.33 \times 10^{10}$	$3.00 \times 10^{13}$

<sup>1</sup> The beef cow, dairy cow, pigs and sheep populations in the Mechumps Creek watershed were estimated by the Hanover-Caroline SWCD, the horse population was estimated at 4.6% of the County horse population, based on area ratio of the Mechumps Creek watershed to Hanover County.

<sup>2</sup> VADCR, 2003

<sup>3</sup> USDA, 1999

### 5.3.3. Wildlife

Like livestock, fecal matter from wildlife can be either deposited directly to the stream, or it can be transported to the stream in surface runoff from woods, pastureland and cropland. Direct deposition to streams varies with species, e.g. beaver spend most of their time in water; therefore most of their fecal matter would be directly deposited to the stream.

Wildlife populations in the Mechumps Creek watershed were estimated based on wildlife densities used in developing other bacterial TMDLs in Virginia in Table 10. Deer densities were supplied by a UVA deer population model for Hanover County. Turkey, muskrat, beaver, and duck densities were supplied by Maptech 2002. Raccoon densities were taken from Yagow 1999. Geese densities used were the highest found in final and draft TMDLs in Virginia, and came from the Catoctin Creek TMDL from Loudoun County, because Hanover County is closer to the eastern flyway than Loudoun County, and appears to have a large resident geese population. Habitat was assigned as follows:

- deer: all land use categories
- turkey: deciduous forest, evergreen forest, mixed forest
- muskrat: woody wetlands, emergent herbaceous wetlands, open water
- beaver: stream miles
- raccoon: low intensity residential, deciduous forest, evergreen forest, mixed forest, woody wetlands, row crops
- geese: pasture/hay, row crops, emergent herbaceous wetlands, open water

Source	Population Density	Habitat	Watershed Population (animals)	Range of Daily Fecal Coliform Production <sup>1</sup> (cfu/an/day)		Range of Annual Fecal Coliform Production (cfu/yr)	
				<i>low</i>	<i>high</i>	<i>low</i>	<i>high</i>
Deer	0.020 an/ac	13942.83 ac	279	$1.52 \times 10^8$	$3.60 \times 10^8$	$1.55 \times 10^{13}$	$3.67 \times 10^{13}$
Turkey	0.01 an/ac	7,709.82 ac	77	$9.3 \times 10^7$		$2.61 \times 10^{12}$	
Muskrat	2.75 an/ac	1086.4 ac	2988	$2.50 \times 10^7$	$1.90 \times 10^8$	$2.72 \times 10^{13}$	$2.07 \times 10^{14}$
Beaver	4.800 an/mi	29.2 mi	141	$3.00 \times 10^5$		$1.54 \times 10^{10}$	
Raccoon	0.070 an/ac	11653.91 ac	816	$2.05 \times 10^7$	$9.45 \times 10^8$	$6.11 \times 10^{12}$	$2.81 \times 10^{14}$
Geese	0.020 an/ac	4061.6 ac	82	$5.87 \times 10^4$	$2.25 \times 10^9$	$1.76 \times 10^9$	$6.73 \times 10^{13}$
Total						$5.14 \times 10^{13}$	$5.95 \times 10^{14}$

<sup>1</sup>VADCR, 2003

## 6. TMDL Development

One of the major obstacles to improving stream water quality is that the potential sources of bacteria are numerous and the dominant sources and/or pathways are generally unknown. This can make it difficult to direct effective cleanup efforts.

Typical pathogen TMDLs are completed by developing watershed-based computer simulations that establish links between sources and in-stream water quality. While effective, the effort required to develop modeled TMDLs can be costly. In an effort to complete pathogen TMDLs in a timely and cost-effective manner, the use of load-duration analyses has been investigated. It has been determined that the load-duration method of calculating a TMDL produces a result only slightly more conservative than if the TMDL had been determined through computer modeling.

The load duration method essentially uses an entire stream flow record to provide insight into the flow conditions under which exceedances of the water quality standard occur. Exceedances that occur under low flow conditions are generally attributed to loads delivered directly to the stream such as straight pipes and livestock with access to the stream. Exceedances that occur under high flow conditions are typically attributed to loads that are delivered to the stream in stormwater runoff. Exceedances occurring during normal flows can be attributed to a combination of runoff and direct deposits.

The following sections detail the development of the load-duration TMDL and associated allocations.

### 6.1. *Load-Duration Curve*

Development of a load-duration curve begins with a flow-duration curve, and in order to develop a meaningful flow-duration curve one must have several years of flow data for the target stream or river. Where very little flow data exists for a target stream, a reference stream with the requisite flow measurements must be used similar to the paired watershed approach used in watershed-based modeling. Such is the case for Mechumps Creek.

The following sections detail the flow data for Mechumps Creek, the selection of a reference stream, development of a flow-duration curve for Mechumps Creek, and the creation of a load-duration curve for Mechumps Creek.

#### 6.1.1. Flow Data

Mechumps Creek is located in central Hanover County and has a drainage area of 21.8 square miles. It is a tributary to the Pamunkey River with its confluence approximately 2.4 miles downstream of Hanover Courthouse, VA. There is no continuous flow gaging station on Mechumps Creek, therefore a reference gaging station must be selected.



### 6.1.2. Reference Stream

In order to develop a flow-duration curve for Mechumps Creek, it was necessary to select a reference stream with a gage having a period of record of no less than ten years.

In selecting a reference gauge several factors must be considered. Among these are proximity, watershed topography, watershed size and geology. The period of record for the reference gage must also include dates that coincide with flow measurements made at the target stream - in this case Mechumps Creek. The ultimate goal is to find a gaged stream that behaves like the target stream.

For the Mechumps Creek analysis, Little River near Doswell, VA (#01671100), Piscataway Creek near Tappahannock, VA (#01669000), Po River near Spotsylvania, VA (#01673800), and Totopotomoy Creek near Studley, VA (#01673550) were considered as possible reference gages. Totopotomoy Creek had the strongest correlation with an R value of 0.74, and is the second downstream Pamunkey River tributary in Hanover County, with similar land use, therefore Totopotomoy Creek was used as the reference stream. Details of the correlation analysis and reference stream selection are presented in Appendix D.

### 6.1.3. Flow-Duration Curves


In order to use the load-duration method to develop a TMDL, a flow-duration curve must be developed for the impaired stream. This is accomplished by first developing a flow-duration curve for the reference Totopotomoy Creek gage. Then to generate a flow-duration curve for Mechumps Creek the Totopotomoy Creek flows corresponding to the percentiles 1%, 5%, 10%...90%, 95%, 99% were plugged into the regression equation ( $y=0.5373x^{1.015}$ ) obtained from the flow regression for Mechumps Creek with Totopotomoy Creek, and a set of flows was generated for Mechumps Creek. The generated flows were plotted against the percentiles from above, and a flow duration curve was drawn for Mechumps Creek (Figure 10).

A flow-duration curve is a plot showing the flow magnitude (cfs) along the "y" axis and the frequency of daily average stream flow (%) along the "x" axis. For example, the flow value corresponding to "1%" is the flow that has been exceeded only 1% of the time for which measurements exist. Likewise, the flow value corresponding to "30%" is the flow that 30% of the historic record exceeds.

To plot the flow values for the period of record of the reference stream, the PERCENTILE statistic function of Excel was used. The resulting percentile of a given flow was then subtracted from 1 to yield the percent of time that a given flow is exceeded by the flows of record. The flow duration interval values were plotted with the corresponding flows to yield a log/normal flow duration curve.

The flow-duration curve for Mechumps Creek has been divided into four sections to help illustrate flow conditions. These sections are titled "High Flows", "Transition Flows", "Normal Flows", and "Low Flows". Low flows can be roughly equated to near-drought or drought flows. High flows are near-flood or flood flows. Transition flows are, as implied, neither normal nor high.

**Figure 10. Flow-duration curve for Mechumps Creek near Hanover Courthouse, VA  
(station 8-MCP002.42)**



#### 6.1.4. Load-Duration Curve

As mentioned in Section 3, all of the instream water quality observations on Mechumps Creek were collected at Station 8-MCP002.42, therefore this station is the focus of the load-duration analysis on Mechumps Creek.

A load-duration curve is developed by multiplying each flow level along the flow-duration curve by the applicable water quality standard and required unit conversions. The resulting curve represents the maximum allowable load at each flow level, in other words, the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL). Each water quality observation is then assigned to a flow interval by comparing the date of each water quality observation to the flow record of the reference stream. The reference stream flow from the date of the water quality observation is then used to calculate a stream flow and flow-duration interval for the target stream. Since the TMDL and required reductions must be in terms of an average annual stream flow, the loads on the load-duration curve are multiplied by 365 days/year and presented as annual loads.

In order to plot existing fecal coliform (FC) data against the *E. coli* (EC) standard/TMDL line, it was necessary to translate the FC data to EC data. Translation of FC data to EC data was achieved by using a translator equation developed from a regression analysis of 493 paired FC/EC data sets from the DEQ's statewide monitoring network. The translator equation resulting from the regression analysis is presented below:

$$\text{EC log}_2 = -0.0172 + 0.91905 * \text{FC log}_2$$

By plotting these observed loads on the load-duration curve, the number and pattern of exceedances of the water quality standard (TMDL) can be analyzed. The load duration curve and observed data for Mechumps Creek are shown in Figure 11. The TMDL line has been plotted for the instantaneous *E. coli* standard of 235 cfu/100mL.



**Figure 11. Load duration curve and observed data for Mechumps Creek at station 8-MCP002.42**

Figure 11 suggests that exceedances of the water quality standard occur under all flow conditions. The highest exceedance of the water quality standard occurred at low flow (90% flow interval at 2.14 cfs). This represents the flow condition under which the largest bacteria reduction is required in order to meet water quality standards. The translated load at the low flow condition was  $7.21 \times 10^{13}$  cfu/yr. Under the instantaneous *E. coli* standard of 235 cfu/100mL, this loads would have to be reduced by 94% to an allowable load of  $4.49 \times 10^{12}$  cfu/yr at low flow. The allowable load is simply the *E. coli* standard multiplied by the applicable flow condition and the proper unit conversions. The full calculation with unit conversions is presented in Appendix C.

In order to determine the necessary load reduction at the average annual flow condition, a second curve must be drawn through the highest exceedance described above. The second curve represents the magnitude of the highest observed exceedance if it were to occur over any flow condition. The graph of the load-duration curve with the max-exceedance curve is presented in Figure 12.

**Figure 12. Load duration curve with max exceedance curve for Mechumps Creek at station 8-MCP002.42**



## 6.2 TMDL


A Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) consists of 1) point source/waste load allocations (WLAs), 2) non-point sources/load allocations (LAs) where the non-point sources include natural/background levels, and 3) a margin of safety (MOS) where the margin of safety may be implicitly or explicitly defined. This TMDL definition is typically illustrated by the following equation:

$$\text{TMDL} = \text{WLAs} + \text{LAs} + \text{MOS}$$

Simply put, a TMDL is the amount of a pollutant that can be present in a waterbody where the waterbody will still meet water quality standards for that pollutant. In the case of load-duration bacteria TMDLs, the TMDL is expressed as the total number of colony forming units (cfu) per year as opposed to cfu/day. This is because the load-duration TMDL must be based on the average annual flow condition.

The average annual flow for Mechumps Creek is calculated from the regression equation  $y = 0.5373X^{1.015}$  and the average annual flow from the reference gage. The estimated average annual flow for Mechumps Creek is 14.66 cfs. This flow value has an associated flow duration of 31.1%. From this information an average annual *E. coli* load and TMDL can be calculated from the max-exceedance and TMDL curves. This is represented graphically in Figure 13. The full calculation is presented in Appendix C.

**Figure 13. Load duration curve illustrating the TMDL and estimated average annual *E. Coli* load for Mechumps Creek at station 8-MCP002.42**



The average annual *E. coli* load is  $5.00 \times 10^{14}$  cfu/yr, and the TMDL under average annual flow conditions is  $3.08 \times 10^{13}$  cfu/yr. These values are used to calculate required reductions. The non-point source (NPS) load allocation,  $2.98 \times 10^{13}$  cfu/yr, was determined by subtracting the waste load allocation (known value from point sources, Section 5.2) from the TMDL (as determined above). These three values are presented in Table 11.

**Table 11. Average annual *E. coli* loads and TMDL for Mechumps Creek watershed (cfu/yr)**

WLA <sup>1</sup>	LA	MOS	TMDL
$1.00 \times 10^{12}$	$2.98 \times 10^{13}$	(implicit)	$3.08 \times 10^{13}$

<sup>1</sup> The two point sources permitted to discharge in the Mechumps Creek watershed are presented in section 5.2. Each is permitted to discharge  $1.74 \times 10^9$  cfu/yr.

## 7. Allocations

### Reduction

The annual average TMDL and *E. coli* load values from section 6.2, together with the waste load allocation from the two permitted bacteria sources in section 5.2, were plugged into Table 12 to determine the required reduction. Since the required reduction will only apply to the non-point sources, the LA value was used to calculate the required percent reduction. The full calculations are presented in Appendix C.

**Table 12. TMDL and required reduction for Mechumps Creek**

Allowable Loads (cfu/yr)		Average Annual EC Load (cfu/yr)	Required Reduction
<b>TMDL (annual average)</b>	<b><math>3.08 \times 10^{13}</math></b>		
Wasteload Allocation (WLA)	$9.86 \times 10^{11}$		
MOS	(implicit)		
<b>Load Allocation (LA)</b>	<b><math>3.06 \times 10^{13}</math></b>	<b><math>5.00 \times 10^{14}</math></b>	<b>93.88%</b>

As illustrated in Tables 11 and 12, the WLA for the Tuckahoe Creek watershed represents approximately 3.25 percent of the TMDL annual average. An additional scenario where the point source portion of the WLA has been increased by a factor of five was developed and is presented in Appendix F. This scenario gives flexibility to accommodate future expansion and/or additional discharges in the watershed.

### Margin of Safety

This requirement is intended to add a level of safety to account for any inherent uncertainty in the TMDL development process and the data used in the development. The MOS may be either implicit or explicit. An implicit margin of safety relies on the conservative nature of the assumptions, values, and methods used to calculate a TMDL whereas an explicit margin of safety is a value (typically a percentage) applied at some point during the TMDL calculation.

In the Mechumps Creek TMDL, an implicit MOS was incorporated through the use of conservative analytical assumptions. These include: (1) the use of the single-most extreme water quality violation event which was used to develop maximum exceedance curve over the entire range of flow conditions, and (2) the computation of average annual load using the average flow conditions. Additionally, the load duration method of TMDL development has been evaluated against TMDLs that were developed using computer modeling. The results showed the load duration method to be slightly more conservative.



## Allocations

In order to apply the reduction calculated above, the average annual *E. coli* load had to be allocated to each of the four non-point sources identified in the BST analysis. Table 13 shows the distribution of the average annual *E. coli* load among sources (derived by multiplying the average annual load by the BST source percent for each of the four source groups), the reduction applied to each source, and the allowable loading for each source. Theoretically these reductions would reduce the *E. coli* load to the water quality standard, resulting in zero violations.

**Table 13. Average annual load distribution, reduction, and allowable load by source**

	<b>Total (cfu/yr)</b>	<b>Human @ 12% (cfu/yr)</b>	<b>Pet @ 37% (cfu/yr)</b>	<b>Livestock @ 29% (cfu/yr)</b>	<b>Wildlife @ 22% (cfu/yr)</b>
<b>Average Annual Load</b>	$5.00 \times 10^{14}$	$6.00 \times 10^{13}$	$1.85 \times 10^{14}$	$1.45 \times 10^{14}$	$1.10 \times 10^{14}$
<b>Reduction</b>	93.88%	99%	99%	99%	75.73%
<b>Allowable Load Allocation/TMDL</b>	$3.06 \times 10^{13}$	$6.00 \times 10^{11}$	$1.85 \times 10^{12}$	$1.45 \times 10^{12}$	$2.67 \times 10^{13}$

### 7.1. Consideration of Critical Conditions

EPA regulations at 40 CFR 130.7 (c)(1) require TMDLs to take into account critical conditions for stream flow, loading, and water quality parameters. The intent of this requirement is to ensure that the water quality of Mechumps Creek is protected during times when conditions are most conducive for water quality criteria exceedances.

Critical conditions are important because they describe the factors that combine to cause a violation of water quality standards and will help in identifying the actions that may have to be undertaken to meet water quality standards. The sources of bacteria for Mechumps Creek are a mixture of dry and wet weather driven sources. TMDL development utilizing the load-duration approach applies to the full range of flow conditions; therefore, the critical conditions for Mechumps Creek were addressed during TMDL development.

### 7.2. Consideration of Seasonal Variations

Seasonal variations involve changes in stream flow and water quality as a result of hydrologic and climatological patterns. The load-duration approach allows the pattern of water quality exceedances to be examined for seasonal variations. The load-duration method used to develop this TMDL implicitly incorporates the seasonal variations of precipitation and runoff by looking at the highest water quality violation and applying it to the entire stream flow record when calculating the TMDL.

## 8.0 TMDL Implementation

The goal of the TMDL program is to establish a three-step path that will lead to attainment of water quality standards. The first step in the process is to develop TMDLs that will result in meeting water quality standards. This report represents the culmination of that effort for the bacteria impairments on Mechumps Creek. The second step is to develop a TMDL implementation plan. The final step is to implement the TMDL implementation plan, and to monitor stream water quality to determine if water quality standards are being attained.

Once a TMDL has been approved by EPA, measures must be taken to reduce pollution levels in the stream. These measures, which can include the use of better treatment technology and the installation of best management practices (BMPs), are implemented in an iterative process that is described along with specific BMPs in the implementation plan. The process for developing an implementation plan has been described in the recent “TMDL Implementation Plan Guidance Manual”, published in July 2003 and available upon request from the DEQ and DCR TMDL project staff or at <http://www.deq.virginia.gov/tmdl/implans/ipguide.pdf>. With successful completion of implementation plans, Virginia will be well on the way to restoring impaired waters and enhancing the value of this important resource. Additionally, development of an approved implementation plan will improve a locality's chances for obtaining financial and technical assistance during implementation.

### 8.1 Staged Implementation

In general, Virginia intends for the required reductions to be implemented in an iterative process that first addresses those sources with the largest impact on water quality. For example, in agricultural areas of the watershed, the most promising management practice is livestock exclusion from streams. This has been shown to be very effective in lowering bacteria concentrations in streams, both by reducing the cattle deposits themselves and by providing additional riparian buffers.

Additionally, in both urban and rural areas, reducing the human bacteria loading from failing septic systems should be a primary implementation focus because of its health implications. This component could be implemented through education on septic tank pump-outs as well as a septic system repair/replacement program and the use of alternative waste treatment systems.

In urban areas, reducing the human bacteria loading from leaking sewer lines could be accomplished through a sanitary sewer inspection and management program. Other BMPs that might be appropriate for controlling urban wash-off from parking lots and roads and that could be readily implemented may include more restrictive ordinances to reduce fecal loads from pets, improved garbage collection and control, and improved street cleaning.

The iterative implementation of BMPs in the watershed has several benefits:

1. It enables tracking of water quality improvements following BMP implementation through follow-up stream monitoring;
2. It provides a measure of quality control, given the uncertainties inherent in computer simulation modeling;
3. It provides a mechanism for developing public support through periodic updates on BMP implementation and water quality improvements;
4. It helps ensure that the most cost effective practices are implemented first; and
5. It allows for the evaluation of the adequacy of the TMDL in achieving water quality standards.


Watershed stakeholders will have opportunity to participate in the development of the TMDL implementation plan. While specific goals for BMP implementation will be established as part of the implementation plan development, the following stage 1 scenarios are targeted at controllable, anthropogenic bacteria sources and can serve as starting points for targeting BMP implementation activities.

## 8.2. Stage 1 scenarios

The goal of the stage 1 scenarios is to reduce the bacteria loadings from controllable sources (excluding wildlife) such that violations of the single sample maximum criterion (235 cfu/100mL) are less than 10 percent. The stage 1 scenarios were generated with the same model setup as was used for the TMDL allocation scenarios. A margin of safety was not used in determining the stage 1 scenarios.

As stated in Section 7 the TMDL requires a 94% reduction in non-point source loading in order to attain a 0% violation of water quality standards. In order to evaluate interim reduction goals for a phased implementation plan, several reduction levels and their associated violation rates were assessed. Reduction curves for 78%, 70%, and 60% reductions, similar to the max exceedance/reduction curve of Figure 9, were plotted on the Mechumps Creek load-duration curve. These reduction curves are presented in Figure 14.

**Figure 14. Load duration curve illustrating the TMDL and reduction curves for Mechumps Creek at station 8-MCP002.42**



The theoretical violation rates for the various load reductions presented in Figure 14 are shown below in Table 14. These were calculated by dividing the number of E. coli load datapoints above each respective % reduction curve by the total number of E. coli load datapoints (71).

**Table 14. Load Reductions and WQS Violation Rates**

Load Reduction	Violation Rate
94%	0%
78%	10.8%
70%	13.5%
60%	16.2%

Based on the reduction analysis presented above and a goal of 10% or fewer violations of the water quality standard, a suitable Phase I reduction level would be 78%. Table 15 presents the Phase I load allocations based on a 78% reduction of in-stream loads.

**Table 15. Phase I Load Allocations (based on a 78% reduction)**

	Total (cfu/yr)	Human (cfu/yr)	Pet (cfu/yr)	Livestock (cfu/yr)	Wildlife (cfu/yr)
<b>Average Annual Load</b>	$5.00 \times 10^{14}$	$6.00 \times 10^{13}$	$1.85 \times 10^{14}$	$1.45 \times 10^{14}$	$1.10 \times 10^{14}$
<b>Reduction</b>	78%	99%	99%	99%	0%
<b>Target Annual Load</b>	$1.10 \times 10^{14}$	$6.00 \times 10^{11}$	$1.85 \times 10^{12}$	$1.45 \times 10^{12}$	$1.10 \times 10^{14}$

**At the 78 percent total annual load reduction level, which results in a 10.8% violation rate, the total allowable annual load equates to the wildlife load. A complete 100% reduction in human, pet and livestock E. coli loads is not sufficient to return E. coli loads and percent violations less than 10 percent above the water quality standard. Please refer to Section 8.3.5 for a discussion of this phenomenon. Therefore to achieve E. coli loads as close to the TMDL as possible without reducing wildlife load, we propose that human, pet and livestock load reductions be set at a goal of the maximum reduction feasible. We expressed this as a 99 percent reduction in Table 15.**

In order to provide some insight into the nature of the Mechumps Creek water quality violations and to better target possible BMPs, the correlation between violations, stream flow change, and local precipitation was examined.

Results indicate that approximately 70% of the violations occurred during times of precipitation and increasing stream flow or just after a precipitation event with stable or decreasing stream flow. This suggests that those violations could be related to runoff events. The complete analysis is presented in Appendix E.

BMPs effective in correcting dry weather/low-flow violations of the bacteria water quality standard typically include: streamside fencing for cattle exclusion, straight pipe replacement, and septic system repair. Among some of the BMPs effective in reducing bacteria runoff from precipitation events include: riparian buffers zone, retention ponds/basins, range and pasture management, and animal waste management. Detailed lists of BMPs and their relative effectiveness will be presented in the eventual TMDL implementation plan for the Mechumps Creek watershed.

### **Link to Ongoing Restoration Efforts**

Implementation of this TMDL will contribute to on-going water quality improvement efforts aimed at restoring water quality in the Chesapeake Bay. A new tributary strategy is currently being developed for the York River Basin to address the nutrient and sediment reductions required to restore the health of the Chesapeake Bay. Up-to-date information can be found at the tributary strategy web site under <http://www.snr.state.va.us/Initiatives/TributaryStrategies/york.cfm>.

## **8.3 Reasonable Assurance for Implementation**

### **8.3.1 Follow-Up Monitoring**

VADEQ will continue monitoring 8-MCP002.42 in accordance with its ambient watershed monitoring program to evaluate reductions in fecal bacteria counts and the effectiveness of TMDL implementation in attainment of water quality standards. This station will be monitored for a two-year cycle, occurring every six years. The next ambient watershed monitoring cycle for Mechumps Creek begins on July 1, 2007 for two years on a bi-monthly basis.

### **8.3.2 Regulatory Framework**

While section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act and current EPA regulations do not require the development of TMDL implementation plans as part of the TMDL process, they do require reasonable assurance that the load and wasteload allocations can and will be implemented. Additionally, Virginia's 1997 Water Quality Monitoring, Information and Restoration Act (the "Act") directs the State Water Control Board to "develop and implement a plan to achieve fully supporting status for impaired waters" (Section 62.1-44.19.7). The Act also establishes that the implementation plan shall include the date of expected achievement of water quality objectives, measurable goals, corrective actions necessary and the associated costs, benefits and environmental impacts of addressing the impairments. EPA outlines the minimum elements of an approvable implementation plan in its 1999 "Guidance for Water Quality-Based Decisions: The TMDL Process." The listed elements include implementation actions/management measures, timelines, legal or regulatory controls, time required to attain water quality standards, monitoring plans and milestones for attaining water quality standards.

Watershed stakeholders will have opportunities to provide input and to participate in the development of the implementation plan, which will also be supported by regional and local offices of DEQ, DCR, and other cooperating agencies.

Once developed, DEQ intends to incorporate the TMDL implementation plan into the appropriate Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), in accordance with the Clean Water Act's Section 303(e). In response to a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between EPA and DEQ, DEQ also submitted a draft Continuous Planning Process to EPA in which DEQ commits to regularly updating the WQMPs. Thus, the WQMPs will be, among other things, the repository for all TMDLs and TMDL implementation plans developed within a river basin.

### **8.3.3. Implementation Funding Sources**

One potential source of funding for TMDL implementation is Section 319 of the Clean Water Act. Section 319 funding is a major source of funds for Virginia's Nonpoint Source Management Program. Other funding sources for implementation include the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Conservation Reserve Enhancement and Environmental Quality Incentive Programs, the Virginia State Revolving Loan Program, and the Virginia Water Quality Improvement Fund. The TMDL Implementation Plan Guidance Manual contains additional information on funding sources, as well as government agencies that might support implementation efforts and suggestions for integrating TMDL implementation with other watershed planning efforts.

#### 8.3.4. Stormwater Permits

It is the intention of the Commonwealth that the TMDL will be implemented using existing regulations and programs. One of these regulations is the Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (VPDES) Permit Regulation (9 VAC 25-31-10 et seq.) regarding municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS-4s). Section 9 VAC 25-31-120 describes the requirements for storm water discharges. Also, federal regulations state in 40 CFR §122.44(k) that NPDES permit conditions may consist of “Best management practices to control or abate the discharge of pollutants when:...(2) Numeric effluent limitations are infeasible,...”.

The Ashland portion of the Mechumps Creek watershed is covered by Phase II permit VAR040011 for the municipal separate storm sewer system (MS-4) owned by the Town of Ashland. This permit was issued on December 9, 2002. The effective period of coverage is December 9, 2002 to December 9, 2007. The permits state, under Part II.A., that the “permittee must develop, implement, and enforce a storm water management program designed to reduce the discharge of pollutants from the MS4 to the maximum extent practicable (MEP), to protect water quality, and to satisfy the appropriate water quality requirements of the Clean Water Act and the State Water Control Law.”

The permit also contains a TMDL clause that states: “If a TMDL is approved for any waterbody into which the small MS4 discharges, the Board will review the TMDL to determine whether the TMDL includes requirements for control of storm water discharges. If discharges from the MS4 are not meeting the TMDL allocations, the Board will notify the permittee of that finding and may require that the Storm Water Management Program required in Part II be modified to implement the TMDL within a timeframe consistent with the TMDL.”

For MS4/VPDES general permits, DEQ expects revisions to the permittee’s Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans to specifically address the TMDL pollutants of concern. DEQ anticipates that BMP effectiveness would be determined through ambient in-stream monitoring. This is in accordance with recent EPA guidance (EPA Memorandum on TMDLs and Stormwater Permits, dated November 22, 2002). If future monitoring indicates no improvement in stream water quality, the permit could require the MS4 to expand or better tailor its BMPs to achieve the TMDL reductions. However, only failing to implement the required BMPs would be considered a violation of the permit. DEQ acknowledges that it may not be possible to meet the existing water quality standard because of the wildlife issue associated with a number of bacteria TMDLs (see section 8.4.5 below). At some future time, it may therefore become necessary to investigate the stream’s use designation and adjust the water quality criteria through a Use Attainability Analysis. Any changes to the TMDL resulting from water quality standards change on Bailey Creek would be reflected in the permittee’s Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan required by the MS4/VPDES permit.

Additional information on Virginia’s Storm Water Phase 2 program and a downloadable menu of Best Management Practices and Measurable Goals Guidance can be found at <http://www.deq.virginia.gov/vpdes/stormwater.html>.

#### 8.3.5 Addressing Wildlife Contributions

In some streams for which TMDLs have been developed, water quality modeling indicates that even after removal of all bacteria sources (other than wildlife), the stream will not attain standards under all flow regimes at all times. As is the case for Mechumps Creek, these streams may not be able to attain standards without some reduction in wildlife load. **Virginia and EPA are not proposing the elimination of wildlife to allow for the attainment of water quality standards.** While managing overpopulations of wildlife remains as an option to local stakeholders, the reduction of wildlife or changing a natural background condition is not the intended goal of a TMDL.

To address this issue, Virginia has proposed (during its recent triennial water quality standards review) a new “secondary contact” category for protecting the recreational use in state waters. On March 25, 2003, the Virginia State Water Control Board adopted criteria for “secondary contact recreation” which means “a

water-based form of recreation, the practice of which has a low probability for total body immersion or ingestion of waters (examples include but are not limited to wading, boating and fishing)". These new criteria will become effective pending EPA approval and can be found at <http://www.deq.state.va.us/wqs/rule.html>.

In order for the new criteria to apply to a specific stream segment, the primary contact recreational use must be removed. To remove a designated use, the state must demonstrate 1) that the use is not an existing use, 2) that downstream uses are protected, and 3) that the source of bacterial contamination is natural and uncontrollable by effluent limitations and by implementing cost-effective and reasonable best management practices for nonpoint source control (9 VAC 25-260-10). This and other information is collected through a special study called a Use Attainability Analysis (UAA). All site-specific criteria or designated use changes must be adopted as amendments to the water quality standards regulations. Watershed stakeholders and EPA will be able to provide comment during this process.

Based on the above, EPA and Virginia have developed a process to address the wildlife issue. First in this process is the development of a stage 1 scenario such as those presented previously in this chapter. The pollutant reductions in the stage 1 scenario are targeted only at the controllable, anthropogenic bacteria sources identified in the TMDL, setting aside control strategies for wildlife except for cases of overpopulations. During the implementation of the stage 1 scenario, all controllable sources would be reduced to the maximum extent practicable using the iterative approach described in section 8.1 above. DEQ will re-assess water quality in the stream during and subsequent to the implementation of the stage 1 scenario to determine if the water quality standard is attained. This effort will also evaluate if the modeling assumptions were correct. If water quality standards are not being met, a UAA may be initiated to reflect the presence of naturally high bacteria levels due to uncontrollable sources. In some cases, the effort may never have to go to the UAA phase because the water quality standard exceedances attributed to wildlife in the model may have been very small and infrequent and within the margin of error.

## **9. Public Participation**

The development of the Mechumps Creek TMDL is not possible without public participation. A public meeting was held at the Hanover Courthouse EMS Building on Rt 301 at 7 pm on January 27, 2004 to discuss the process for TMDL development and the source assessment input. A Technical Advisory Committee meeting was held at the Piedmont Regional Office training room in Glen Allen, VA at 2 pm on January 15, 2004. Copies of the presentation materials was made available for public distribution. The public meeting was public noticed in the Virginia Register. There was a 30 day-public comment period after the public meeting in which four comments were received. These comments and their responses were submitted to EPA separately from this document.



## 10. References

- APPMA (American Pet Products Manufacturers Association) 2001-2002 National Pet Owners Survey. <http://www.hsus.org/ace/11831> (Accessed 11/06/02)
- Geldreich E. E. Bacterial populations and indicator concepts in feces, sewage, stormwater and solid wastes. In *Indicators of Viruses in Water and Food* (Edited by Berg G.). Ann Arbor Science, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1978.
- Hagedorn, C., Virginia Tech, [http://soils1.cses.vt.edu/ch/biol\\_4684/bst/BST.html](http://soils1.cses.vt.edu/ch/biol_4684/bst/BST.html) 2002. (Accessed 12/31/02)
- ICPRB (Interstate Commission on the Potomac River), *Bacteria TMDLs for the Goose Creek Watershed*, Virginia, 2002.
- MapTech. *Fecal Coliform TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) Development for Catoctin Creek Impairments*. Virginia, 2002.
- MapTech. *Fecal Coliform TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) Development for Gills Creek Impairments*. Virginia, 2002.
- Reneau, R.B. Jr. 2000 Crop and Soil Environmental Sciences. Virginia Tech. Personal communication. January 7, 2000.
- SAIC (Science Applications International Corporation). *Fecal Coliform TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) Development for Holmans Creek, Virginia*. Reston, Virginia. 2001.
- Simpson, J.; Santo Domingo, J.; Reasoner, D. *Env. Science & Technology*. **2002**, 36, 5279-5287.
- SRCC (Southeast Regional Climate Center) [http://www.dnr.state.sc.us/climate/sercc/products/historical/historical\\_va.html](http://www.dnr.state.sc.us/climate/sercc/products/historical/historical_va.html) (Accessed 12/18/02)
- USDA - National Agricultural Statistics Service. 1997 Census of Agriculture, for Hanover County, Virginia. Volume 1. 1999.
- USDA - Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Soil Survey Division. Official Soil Series Description. <http://ortho.ftw.nrcs.usda.gov/cgi-bin/osd/osdname.cgi> (Accessed 12/22/03)
- USEPA (U. S. Environmental Protection Agency), Total Maximum Daily Load Guidance. 1991.
- VADCR (Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation), 2003 Spreadsheet of Animal Fecal Production Rates and Fecal Coliform Densities. William Keeling.
- VADEQ (Virginia Department of Environmental Quality), 2002 303(d) Report on Impaired Waters.
- VADEQ (Virginia Department of Environmental Quality), 1998 303(d) Total Maximum Daily Load Priority List and Report.
- VADEQ (Virginia Department of Environmental Quality), Lynnhaven Bay, Broad and Linkhorn Bay Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Report for Shellfish Areas Listed for Bacteria Contamination, Virginia, 2003.
- Yagow, G. Virginia Tech Department of Bacterial Systems Engineering, Personal telecommunication, 2003.



## **Appendix A**

### **Glossary**

## GLOSSARY

**Note:** All entries in italics are taken from USEPA (1998). All non-italicized entries are taken from MapTech (2002).

**303(d).** A section of the Clean Water Act of 1972 requiring states to identify and list water bodies that do not meet the states' water quality standards.

***Allocations.*** That portion of a receiving water's loading capacity attributed to one of its existing or future pollution sources (nonpoint or point) or to natural background sources. (A wasteload allocation [WLA] is that portion of the loading capacity allocated to an existing or future point source, and a load allocation [LA] is that portion allocated to an existing or future nonpoint source or to natural background levels. Load allocations are best estimates of the loading, which can range from reasonably accurate estimates to gross allotments, depending on the availability of data and appropriate techniques for predicting loading.)

***Ambient water quality.*** Natural concentration of water quality constituents prior to mixing of either point or nonpoint source load of contaminants. Reference ambient concentration is used to indicate the concentration of a chemical that will not cause adverse impact on human health.

***Anthropogenic.*** Pertains to the [environmental] influence of human activities.

***Antidegradation Policies.*** Policies that are part of each states water quality standards. These policies are designed to protect water quality and provide a method of assessing activities that might affect the integrity of waterbodies.

***Background levels.*** Levels representing the chemical, physical, and biological conditions that would result from natural geomorphological processes such as weathering or dissolution.

***Bacteria.*** Single-celled microorganisms. Bacteria of the coliform group are considered the primary indicators of fecal contamination and are often used to assess water quality.

**Bacterial source tracking (BST).** A collection of scientific methods used to track sources of fecal contamination.

***Best management practices (BMPs).*** Methods, measures, or practices determined to be reasonable and cost-effective means for a landowner to meet certain, generally nonpoint source, pollution control needs. BMPs include structural and nonstructural controls and operation and maintenance procedures.

**Biosolids.** Biologically treated solids originating from municipal wastewater treatment plants.

**Clean Water Act (CWA).** *The Clean Water Act (formerly referred to as the Federal Water Pollution Control Act or Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972), Public Law 92-500, as amended by Public Law 96-483 and Public Law 97-117, 33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq. The Clean Water Act (CWA) contains a number of provisions to restore and maintain the quality of the nation's water resources. One of these provisions is section 303(d), which establishes the TMDL program.*

**Concentration.** *Amount of a substance or material in a given unit volume of solution; usually measured in milligrams per liter (mg/L) or parts per million (ppm).*

**Concentration-based limit.** *A limit based on the relative strength of a pollutant in a waste stream, usually expressed in milligrams per liter (mg/L).*

**Confluence.** *The point at which a river and its tributary flow together.*

**Contamination.** *The act of polluting or making impure; any indication of chemical, sediment, or biological impurities.*

**Cost-share program.** *A program that allocates project funds to pay a percentage of the cost of constructing or implementing a best management practice. The remainder of the costs is paid by the producer(s).*

**Critical condition.** *The critical condition can be thought of as the "worst case" scenario of environmental conditions in the waterbody in which the loading expressed in the TMDL for the pollutant of concern will continue to meet water quality standards. Critical conditions are the combination of environmental factors (e.g., flow, temperature, etc.) that results in attaining and maintaining the water quality criterion and has an acceptably low frequency of occurrence.*

**Designated uses.** *Those uses specified in water quality standards for each waterbody or segment whether or not they are being attained.*

**Dilution.** *The addition of some quantity of less-concentrated liquid (water) that results in a decrease in the original concentration.*

**Direct runoff.** *Water that flows over the ground surface or through the ground directly into streams, rivers, and lakes.*

**Discharge.** *Flow of surface water in a stream or canal, or the outflow of groundwater from a flowing artesian well, ditch, or spring. Can also apply to discharge of liquid effluent from a facility or to chemical emissions into the air through designated venting mechanisms.*

**Discharge permits (under NPDES).** *A permit issued by the U.S. EPA or a state regulatory agency that sets specific limits on the type and amount of pollutants that a municipality or industry can discharge to a receiving water; it also includes a compliance schedule for achieving those limits. The permit process was established*

*under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, under provisions of the Federal Clean Water Act.*

**DNA.** Deoxyribonucleic acid. The genetic material of cells and some viruses.

***Domestic wastewater.*** Also called sanitary wastewater, consists of wastewater discharged from residences and from commercial, institutional, and similar facilities.

***Drainage basin.*** A part of a land area enclosed by a topographic divide from which direct surface runoff from precipitation normally drains by gravity into a receiving water. Also referred to as a watershed, river basin, or hydrologic unit.

***Effluent.*** Municipal sewage or industrial liquid waste (untreated, partially treated, or completely treated) that flows out of a treatment plant, septic system, pipe, etc.

***Effluent limitation.*** Restrictions established by a state or EPA on quantities, rates, and concentrations in pollutant discharges.

***Endpoint.*** An endpoint (or indicator/target) is a characteristic of an ecosystem that may be affected by exposure to a stressor. Assessment endpoints and measurement endpoints are two distinct types of endpoints commonly used by resource managers. An assessment endpoint is the formal expression of a valued environmental characteristic and should have societal relevance (an indicator). A measurement endpoint is the expression of an observed or measured response to a stress or disturbance. It is a measurable environmental characteristic that is related to the valued environmental characteristic chosen as the assessment endpoint. The numeric criteria that are part of traditional water quality standards are good examples of measurement endpoints (targets).

***Existing use.*** Use actually attained in the waterbody on or after November 28, 1975, whether or not it is included in the water quality standards (40 CFR 131.3).

**Fecal Coliform.** Indicator organisms (organisms indicating presence of pathogens) associated with the digestive tract.

***Feedlot.*** A confined area for the controlled feeding of animals. Tends to concentrate large amounts of animal waste that cannot be absorbed by the soil and, hence, may be carried to nearby streams or lakes by rainfall runoff.

**Geometric mean.** A measure of the central tendency of a data set that minimizes the effects of extreme values.

**GIS.** Geographic Information System. A system of hardware, software, data, people, organizations and institutional arrangements for collecting, storing, analyzing and disseminating information about areas of the earth. (Dueker and Kjerne, 1989)

**Ground water.** *The supply of fresh water found beneath the earth's surface, usually in aquifers, which supply wells and springs. Because ground water is a major source of drinking water, there is growing concern over contamination from leaching agricultural or industrial pollutants and leaking underground storage tanks.*

**Hydrograph.** *A graph showing variation of stage (depth) or discharge in a stream over a period of time.*

**Hydrologic cycle.** *The circuit of water movement from the atmosphere to the earth and its return to the atmosphere through various stages or processes, such as precipitation, interception, runoff, infiltration, storage, evaporation, and transpiration.*

**Hydrology.** *The study of the distribution, properties, and effects of water on the earth's surface, in the soil and underlying rocks, and in the atmosphere.*

**Indicator.** *A measurable quantity that can be used to evaluate the relationship between pollutant sources and their impact on water quality.*

**Indicator organism.** *An organism used to indicate the potential presence of other (usually pathogenic) organisms. Indicator organisms are usually associated with the other organisms, but are usually more easily sampled and measured.*

**In situ.** *In place; in situ measurements consist of measurements of components or processes in a full-scale system or a field, rather than in a laboratory.*

**Isolate.** *An inbreeding biological population that is isolated from similar populations by physical or other means.*

**Limits (upper and lower).** *The lower limit equals the lower quartile – 1.5x(upper quartile – lower quartile), and the upper limit equals the upper quartile + 1.5x(upper quartile – lower quartile). Values outside these limits are referred to as outliers.*

**Loading, Load, Loading rate.** *The total amount of material (pollutants) entering the system from one or multiple sources; measured as a rate in weight per unit time.*

**Load allocation (LA).** *The portion of a receiving water's loading capacity attributed either to one of its existing or future nonpoint sources of pollution or to natural background sources. Load allocations are best estimates of the loading, which can range from reasonably accurate estimates to gross allotments, depending on the availability of data and appropriate techniques for predicting the loading. Wherever possible, natural and nonpoint source loads should be distinguished (40 CFR 130.2(g)).*

**Loading capacity (LC).** *The greatest amount of loading a water can receive without violating water quality standards.*

**Margin of safety (MOS).** *A required component of the TMDL that accounts for the uncertainty about the relationship between the pollutant loads and the quality of the*

*receiving waterbody (CWA section 303(d)(1)(C)). The MOS is normally incorporated into the conservative assumptions used to develop TMDLs (generally within the calculations or models) and approved by EPA either individually or in state/EPA agreements. If the MOS needs to be larger than that which is allowed through the conservative assumptions, additional MOS can be added as a separate component of the TMDL (in this case, quantitatively, a TMDL = LC = WLA + LA + MOS).*

**Mathematical model.** *A system of mathematical expressions that describe the spatial and temporal distribution of water quality constituents resulting from fluid transport and the one or more individual processes and interactions within some prototype aquatic ecosystem. A mathematical water quality model is used as the basis for waste load allocation evaluations.*

**Mean.** The sum of the values in a data set divided by the number of values in the data set.

**MGD.** Million gallons per day. A unit of water flow, whether discharge or withdraw.

**Monitoring.** *Periodic or continuous surveillance or testing to determine the level of compliance with statutory requirements and/or pollutant levels in various media or in humans, plants, and animals.*

**Narrative criteria.** *Nonquantitative guidelines that describe the desired water quality goals.*

**National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES).** *The national program for issuing, modifying, revoking and re-issuing, terminating, monitoring, and enforcing permits, and imposing and enforcing pretreatment requirements, under sections 307, 402, 318, and 405 of the Clean Water Act.*

**Natural waters.** *Flowing water within a physical system that has developed without human intervention, in which natural processes continue to take place.*

**Non-point source.** *Pollution that originates from multiple sources over a relatively large area. Nonpoint sources can be divided into source activities related to either land or water use including failing septic tanks, improper animal-keeping practices, forest practices, and urban and rural runoff.*

**Numeric targets.** *A measurable value determined for the pollutant of concern, which, if achieved, is expected to result in the attainment of water quality standards in the listed waterbody.*

**Organic matter.** *The organic fraction that includes plant and animal residue at various stages of decomposition, cells and tissues of soil organisms, and substances synthesized by the soil population. Commonly determined as the amount of organic material contained in a soil or water sample.*

**Peak runoff.** *The highest value of the stage or discharge attained by a flood or storm event; also referred to as flood peak or peak discharge.*

**Permit.** *An authorization, license, or equivalent control document issued by EPA or an approved federal, state, or local agency to implement the requirements of an environmental regulation; e.g., a permit to operate a wastewater treatment plant or to operate a facility that may generate harmful emissions.*

**Phased approach.** *Under the phased approach to TMDL development, load allocations and wasteload allocations are calculated using the best available data and information recognizing the need for additional monitoring data to accurately characterize sources and loadings. The phased approach is typically employed when nonpoint sources dominate. It provides for the implementation of load reduction strategies while collecting additional data.*

**Point source.** *Pollutant loads discharged at a specific location from pipes, outfalls, and conveyance channels from either municipal wastewater treatment plants or industrial waste treatment facilities. Point sources can also include pollutant loads contributed by tributaries to the main receiving water stream or river.*

**Pollutant.** *Dredged spoil, solid waste, incinerator residue, sewage, garbage, sewage sludge, munitions, chemical wastes, biological materials, radioactive materials, heat, wrecked or discarded equipment, rock, sand, cellar dirt, and industrial, municipal, and agricultural waste discharged into water. (CWA section 502(6)).*

**Pollution.** *Generally, the presence of matter or energy whose nature, location, or quantity produces undesired environmental effects. Under the Clean Water Act, for example, the term is defined as the man-made or man-induced alteration of the physical, biological, chemical, and radiological integrity of water.*

**Privately owned treatment works.** *Any device or system that is (a) used to treat wastes from any facility whose operator is not the operator of the treatment works and (b) not a publicly owned treatment works.*

**Public comment period.** *The time allowed for the public to express its views and concerns regarding action by EPA or states (e.g., a Federal Register notice of a proposed rule-making, a public notice of a draft permit, or a Notice of Intent to Deny).*

**Publicly owned treatment works (POTW).** *Any device or system used in the treatment (including recycling and reclamation) of municipal sewage or industrial wastes of a liquid nature that is owned by a state or municipality. This definition includes sewers, pipes, or other conveyances only if they convey wastewater to a POTW providing treatment.*

**Raw sewage.** *Untreated municipal sewage.*

**Receiving waters.** *Creeks, streams, rivers, lakes, estuaries, ground-water formations, or other bodies of water into which surface water and/or treated or untreated waste are discharged, either naturally or in man-made systems.*

**Restoration.** *Return of an ecosystem to a close approximation of its presumed condition prior to disturbance.*

**Riparian areas.** *Areas bordering streams, lakes, rivers, and other watercourses. These areas have high water tables and support plants that require saturated soils during all or part of the year. Riparian areas include both wetland and upland zones.*

**Riparian zone.** *The border or banks of a stream. Although this term is sometimes used interchangeably with floodplain, the riparian zone is generally regarded as relatively narrow compared to a floodplain. The duration of flooding is generally much shorter, and the timing less predictable, in a riparian zone than in a river floodplain.*

**Runoff.** *That part of precipitation, snowmelt, or irrigation water that runs off the land into streams or other surface water. It can carry pollutants from the air and land into receiving waters.*

**Septic system.** *An on-site system designed to treat and dispose of domestic sewage. A typical septic system consists of a tank that receives waste from a residence or business and a drain field or subsurface absorption system consisting of a series of percolation lines for the disposal of the liquid effluent. Solids (sludge) that remain after decomposition by bacteria in the tank must be pumped out periodically.*

**Sewer.** *A channel or conduit that carries wastewater and storm water runoff from the source to a treatment plant or receiving stream. Sanitary sewers carry household, industrial, and commercial waste. Storm sewers carry runoff from rain or snow. Combined sewers handle both.*

**Slope.** *The degree of inclination to the horizontal. Usually expressed as a ratio, such as 1:25 or 1 on 25, indicating one unit vertical rise in 25 units of horizontal distance, or in a decimal fraction (0.04), degrees (2 degrees 18 minutes), or percent (4 percent).*

**Stakeholder.** *Any person with a vested interest in the TMDL development.*

**Standard.** *In reference to water quality (e.g. 200 cfu/100 ml geometric mean limit).*

**Storm runoff.** *Storm water runoff, snowmelt runoff, and surface runoff and drainage; rainfall that does not evaporate or infiltrate the ground because of impervious land surfaces or a soil infiltration rate lower than rainfall intensity, but instead flows onto adjacent land or into waterbodies or is routed into a drain or sewer system.*

**Streamflow.** *Discharge that occurs in a natural channel. Although the term "discharge" can be applied to the flow of a canal, the word "streamflow" uniquely describes the discharge in a surface stream course. The term "streamflow" is more general than "runoff" since streamflow may be applied to discharge whether or not it is affected by diversion or regulation.*



**Stream restoration.** *Various techniques used to replicate the hydrological, morphological, and ecological features that have been lost in a stream because of urbanization, farming, or other disturbance.*

**Surface area.** *The area of the surface of a waterbody; best measured by planimetry or the use of a geographic information system.*

**Surface runoff.** *Precipitation, snowmelt, or irrigation water in excess of what can infiltrate the soil surface and be stored in small surface depressions; a major transporter of nonpoint source pollutants.*

**Surface water.** *All water naturally open to the atmosphere (rivers, lakes, reservoirs, ponds, streams, impoundments, seas, estuaries, etc.) and all springs, wells, or other collectors directly influenced by surface water.*

**Topography.** *The physical features of a geographic surface area including relative elevations and the positions of natural and man-made features.*

**Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL).** *The sum of the individual wasteload allocations (WLAs) for point sources, load allocations (LAs) for nonpoint sources and natural background, plus a margin of safety (MOS). TMDLs can be expressed in terms of mass per time, toxicity, or other appropriate measures that relate to a state's water quality standard.*

**Transport of pollutants (in water).** *Transport of pollutants in water involves two main processes: (1) advection, resulting from the flow of water, and (2) dispersion, or transport due to turbulence in the water.*

**Tributary.** *A lower order-stream compared to a receiving waterbody. "Tributary to" indicates the largest stream into which the reported stream or tributary flows.*

**Variance.** *A measure of the variability of a data set. The sum of the squared deviations (observation – mean) divided by (number of observations) – 1.*

**DACS.** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services.

**DCR.** Department of Conservation and Recreation.

**DEQ.** Virginia Department of Environmental Quality.

**VDH.** Virginia Department of Health.

**Wasteload allocation (WLA).** *The portion of a receiving waters' loading capacity that is allocated to one of its existing or future point sources of pollution. WLAs constitute a type of water quality-based effluent limitation (40 CFR 130.2(h)).*

**Wastewater.** *Usually refers to effluent from a sewage treatment plant. See also **Domestic wastewater**.*

**Wastewater treatment.** *Chemical, biological, and mechanical procedures applied to an industrial or municipal discharge or to any other sources of contaminated water to remove, reduce, or neutralize contaminants.*

**Water quality.** *The biological, chemical, and physical conditions of a waterbody. It is a measure of a waterbody's ability to support beneficial uses.*

**Water quality criteria.** *Levels of water quality expected to render a body of water suitable for its designated use, composed of numeric and narrative criteria. Numeric criteria are scientifically derived ambient concentrations developed by EPA or states for various pollutants of concern to protect human health and aquatic life. Narrative criteria are statements that describe the desired water quality goal. Criteria are based on specific levels of pollutants that would make the water harmful if used for drinking, swimming, farming, fish production, or industrial processes.*


**Water quality standard.** *Law or regulation that consists of the beneficial designated use or uses of a waterbody, the numeric and narrative water quality criteria that are necessary to protect the use or uses of that particular waterbody, and an antidegradation statement.*

**Watershed.** *A drainage area or basin in which all land and water areas drain or flow toward a central collector such as a stream, river, or lake at a lower elevation.*

**WQIA.** Water Quality Improvement Act.

**Appendix B**  
**Antibiotic Resistance Analysis**  
**(MapTech)**


When performing ARA, isolates (colonies picked from membrane filtration plates) of *E. coli* or *Enterococcus* are transferred to a 96-well tissue culture plate (one isolate per well) containing a selective liquid medium. The 96-well plates are incubated and confirmed as *E. coli* or



*Enterococcus* by color changes in the liquid after incubation (Figure 1). Antibiotic stock solutions are prepared and each of twenty-eight or more antibiotic/concentrations is added separately to flasks of autoclaved and cooled Trypticase Soy Agar (TSA) from the stock solutions to achieve the desired concentration, and then poured into sterile 15x100mm petri dishes.

**Figure 1.** 96-well plate after incubation.

Control plates (no antibiotics) are included with each set. Isolates are transferred from the 96-well plate using a stainless steel 48-prong replica plater (Sigma). The replicator is flame-sterilized (95% ethanol) after inoculation of each TSA plate. Resistance to an antibiotic is determined by comparing each isolate to the growth of that isolate on the control plate. A one (1) is recorded for growth and a zero (0) is recorded for no growth (Figure 2). This is repeated for each isolate on each of the 30 antibiotic plates to develop a profile.



**Figure 2.** TSA control plate (with no antibiotics) showing growth of all 48 isolates.

The profile is then compared against the known source library to determine the source of the isolate (see data analysis section). The basic process is the same for all approaches, that is, a data base of known sources analyzed using the BST method of choice must be developed and samples of unknown bacterial origin are collected, analyzed and compared to the known source database. For studies, such as Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL), we recommend the ARA procedure due to typical cost constraints. Typically we analyze 24 isolates per unknown source (e.g. stream or well water) sample. This provides measurements of the proportion of a given source that are in increments of approximately 4%. If more precision is required, 48 isolates can be analyzed, resulting in resolution of approximately 2%. If the sampling is to be done in a geographical area where a database of known sources has not been developed, we will need to collect samples from known sources (i.e. human, livestock, wildlife) and compare them to our existing databases to determine if one of our existing databases is compatible with the study area. Twenty-four isolates from each of these samples will be analyzed. If no existing database is compatible, we will need to develop a database for the study area. The number of samples needed depend on variability of source samples. We have had a good deal of success in the past by using existing databases through obtaining known source samples from each group (i.e. human, livestock, wildlife) in the study area and comparing them to existing databases.

## **Appendix C**

### **Calculations**

## Calculations

### Point Source waste load calculation from Section 5.2.

permitted discharge concentration (126 cfu/100 ml) \* design flow (0.001 MGD) \* 1000000 g/MGD \* 3.7853 L/g \* 1000 mL/L / 100 mL cfu \* 365 d / yr

For Ashland MS4: 1313.28 total acres in Ashland town limits in Mechumps watershed from topos.

High Intensity Residential (all in Ashland) = 617.37 acres x 50% imperviousness = 308.68 impervious acres

Low Intensity Residential = 1313.28 Ashland total acres – 617.37 High Intensity Residential Ashland = 695.91 acres x 20% imperviousness = 139.18 impervious acres

High Intensity Commercial / Industrial = 0 acres x 70% imperviousness = 0 impervious acres

Total Ashland portion of Mechumps watershed impervious acres = 308.68 ac + 139.18 + 0 ac = 447.86 impervious ac.

Ashland portion of Mechumps impervious acres 447.86 ac / Total Mechumps acres 13942.83 ac = 3.2 %  
Total Ashland portion of Mechumps watershed imperviousness

Total Ashland portion of Mechumps watershed 3.2% imperviousness X TMDL allowable load from Section 6.2,  $3.08 \times 10^{13}$  cfu/yr =  **$9.86 \times 10^{11}$  cfu/yr Ashland MS4 wasteload allocation**

### Allowable Load Calculation from Section 6.14.

TMDL cfu/yr = Avg annual Q ft<sup>3</sup>/s \* 7.48 gal/ft<sup>3</sup> \* 3.785 l/gal \* 1000 ml/l \* 235 cfu/100 ml \* 60 s/min \* 60 min/day \* 24 hrs/day \* 365 days/yr,

Or TMDL cfu/yr = Avg annual Q ft<sup>3</sup>/s \*  $2.098176173 \times 10^{12}$

Where:

**TMDL cfu/yr** = Allowable load in cfu/yr

**235 cfu/100 ml** = Instantaneous *E. coli* standard

**Average annual Q ft<sup>3</sup>/s** = Average annual flow in cubic feet per second

**cfu** = *E. coli* colony forming units.

**l** = liters

**ml** = milliliters

**s** = seconds

**min** = minutes

**yr** = year

**gal** = gallons

### Required Reduction Calculation from Section 7.

TMDL cfu/yr = LA cfu/yr + WLA cfu/yr + MOS (cfu/yr)

OL = LA cfu/yr + WLA cfu/yr

% reduction = [(OL - TMDL)/OL] \* 100

Where:

TMDL = total maximum daily load

C2

LA = load allocation

WLA = waste load allocation

MOS = margin of safety

OL = observed load ( = **average annual load** )






**Appendix D**  
**Reference Stream Selection**

Once several possible reference watersheds are selected, a correlation analysis is performed on the flow measurements of the reference and target gauges. Usually the reference gauge with the strongest correlation to the target gauge is selected; however, the final decision is subject to best professional judgement. In some cases a watershed with a lower correlation may be a better choice.

The reference stream correlation is performed by entering the flow measurement data from the target stream (Mechumps Creek) into an Excel spreadsheet along with daily mean flow data from the reference streams. The Excel "Correlation" data analysis tool is then run to determine "R" or the Pearson's correlation coefficient which can be used as an indication of the strength of the correlation. In this analysis absolute values of the Pearson's coefficient between 0-0.19 were regarded as indicating a very weak correlation, 0.2-0.39 as weak, 0.40-0.59 as moderate, 0.6-0.79 as strong and 0.8-1 as a very strong correlation.

Using the Excel graphing package, the measurement data from Mechumps Creek were plotted against the corresponding daily mean flow data for the Totopotomoy Creek gage. Excel was then used to draw a best-fit line through the data points and develop the equation for the "regression" line (Figure 7). Using the equation for the regression line, daily mean flow values from Totopotomoy Creek could be plugged into the "x" or independent variable in the equation and the flow at the Mechumps Creek site, the "y" or dependent variable, could be calculated.

Figure



## **Appendix E**

### **Flow Change and Precipitation Analysis**


In order to better target BMPs for the Mechumps Creek watershed, the correlation between water quality violations, stream flow changes and precipitation was investigated. The goal was to determine which violations might be related to runoff and which might be related to direct deposition.

As stated in Section 6.1 on flow data, there was no continuous stream gage in the Mechumps Creek watershed, so there is little historic flow data. For this reason, the continuous gage at Totopotomoy Creek near Studley (station 01673550) was used to develop the flow duration curve for Mechumps Creek. When assessing the correlation between flow change and violations it was flow changes at the Totopotomoy Creek gage that were examined. The theory being flow changes at the Totopotomoy Creek gage, located approximately 8.5 mile east-southeast of the Mechumps Creek site, would reflect flow changes in Mechumps Creek. Changes in flow might, in turn, signify runoff from precipitation events.

To assess the link between flow changes and precipitation events, precipitation records from the Ashland, VA weather station (COOP ID 440327), located in the headwaters of the Mechumps Creek watershed, were examined. Precipitation events on the day before and on the day of each violation were examined. Precipitation events on the day before the violation were examined to see if decreasing flows on violation days were the result of a precipitation event within the preceding 24 hours.

Results of the study are presented graphically and in tabular format below.

#### Precipitation and Flow Annotated WQS Violation Events (Mechumps Creek Watershed)



## Water Quality Standard Violations, Stream Flow Change, and Precipitation

Sample Date	Measured Fecal Coliform Value (cfu/100 ml)	Translated <i>E. coli</i> Value (cfu/100 ml)	Duration Interval (%)	<i>E. coli</i> Load (cfu/yr)	Increasing Flow	Same Day Precipitation (inches)	Prior Day Precipitation (inches)
03/13/2001	1300	719	40	4.58E+13	Yes	0.27	0.00
01/30/2001	400	243	5.9	6.54E+13	Yes	0.60	0.00
09/26/2000	8000	3819	7.9	8.62E+14	Yes	1.52	0.25
05/22/2000	3000	1550	44.5	8.71E+13	Yes	0.06	0.08
05/19/1999	500	299	70.7	6.42E+12	No	0.00	0.00
01/04/1999	500	299	33	2.33E+13	Yes	0.00	1.70
09/30/1997	1200	668	70.7	1.44E+13	No	0.00	1.44
08/13/1996	4900	2434	0.6	2.69E+15	Yes	2.05	0.54
05/16/1996	2500	1311	9.0	2.69E+14	Yes	0.66	0.00
05/30/1995	400	243	58.5	8.79E+12	No	0.00	0.00
11/01/1994	1300	719	64.3	2.04E+13	Yes	0.00	0.00
08/03/1994	400	243	87.9	2.17E+12	No	0.00	0.00
05/17/1994	1200	668	45.5	3.63E+13	No	0.00	0.16
11/04/1992	1200	668	33.9	5.07E+13	Yes	0.22	1.17
	Positive flow change with same day or prior day precipitation event.						
	Negative or stable flow change with prior day precipitation event.						

The results of the study suggest that as many as 10 of the 14 violations (71%) could be related to runoff events.

Additional information regarding the nature of the violation can be gleaned from looking at the flow conditions under which the violations occur. Four of the violations including the violation requiring the highest load reduction occur during high flows. All but one of the remaining violations occur in the range of normal flows.

## **Appendix F**

### **TMDL Scenario with WLA increased by a factor of 5**

The following tables represent a TMDL scenario where the WLA for the point source discharger has been increased by a factor of five, and the MS4 WLA has been added to that expanded total. The scenario was presented to the public and is intended to be appended to the TMDL report. The expanded WLA for the Mechumps Creek watershed represents approximately **11.8** percent of the TMDL annual average, and a **41.9** percent increase in the original WLA. The expanded WLA results in a **3.6** percent decrease in the NPS load allocation.

**Table A. Average annual *E. coli* loads and TMDL for Mechumps Creek watershed (cfu/yr)**

WLA <sup>1</sup>	LA	MOS	TMDL
$1.66 \times 10^{13}$	$1.33 \times 10^{14}$	(implicit)	$1.50 \times 10^{14}$

<sup>1</sup>The point sources permitted to discharge in the Tuckahoe Creek watershed are presented in section 5.2.

**Table B. TMDL and required reduction for Mechumps Creek**

Allowable Loads (cfu/yr)		Average Annual EC Load (cfu/yr)	Required Reduction
TMDL annual average	$3.08 \times 10^{13}$		
Wasteload Allocation (WLA)	$1.00 \times 10^{12}$		
MOS	(implicit)		
<b>Load Allocation</b>	<b><math>2.98 \times 10^{13}</math></b>	<b><math>5.00 \times 10^{15}</math></b>	<b>94.04%</b>

**Table C. Average annual load distribution, reduction, and allowable load by source**

	Total (cfu/yr)	Human @ 12% (cfu/yr)	Pet @ 39% (cfu/yr)	Livestock @ 28% (cfu/yr)	Wildlife @ 20% (cfu/yr)
<b>Average Annual Load</b>	<b><math>4.60 \times 10^{15}</math></b>	$5.52 \times 10^{14}$	$1.79 \times 10^{15}$	$1.29 \times 10^{15}$	$9.20 \times 10^{14}$
<b>Reduction</b>	97.11%	99%	99%	99%	89.49%
<b>Target Annual Load/TMDL</b>	<b><math>1.33 \times 10^{14}</math></b>	<b><math>5.52 \times 10^{12}</math></b>	<b><math>1.79 \times 10^{13}</math></b>	<b><math>1.29 \times 10^{13}</math></b>	<b><math>9.67 \times 10^{13}</math></b>